The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL.

THESE pages are not to be filled, as some readers evidently anticipate, by impressions of America! But it is good to see ourselves as others see us, and we cannot refrain from passing on this paragraph from a Middle West newspaper:

> Helium gas is being kept by the monopoly of our country from the German lighter-than-air craft for their regular trans-oceanic service of peace. Possible future war-use is charged; as if, without an adequate reserve-supply, that were possible! Meanwhile ample stores of bombing-planes have gone forward to the British for "peace-time" bombings in Asia Minor, in India, and elsewhere. In Franco and in the Japanese, of course, the bombing of civilians is reprobate, but the Union-Jack can do no wrong; moreover, it waves over a fellow "have-nation". Q.E.D.

The outstanding and overwhelming impression a quick trip to the States did leave with us was of the urgent need for the dissemination of accurate information between America and Britain. To find even the best New England papers convinced of the inevitability and the imminence of war in Europe, and under the delusion that in England people think night and day of nothing but war preparations and air raid precautions, came as a staggering shock. It may be estimated merely another sign of our decadence when our people are much more concerned with Test Matches and Football Pools than with the European situation; the Englishman's obsession with sport may be regarded as stupid and blind optimism, or even as fiddling when Rome burns. But somehow it ought to be possible to get across an ocean which can be traversed in less than four days more correct pictures of the life and thought of the opposite number than the head-lines in the press convey.

Have not the Christian Churches a duty "right here"? They are branches of the one Church, an international organization, with means of communication ready to hand. Perhaps the proposed World Council of the Churches will have as one of its most useful functions the facilitation of the spread of news that is true. An interesting side-light on the World Council, by the way, is seen in Dr. Bornhausen's contribution within, with its strong insistence that the Churches should not interfere in political and economic affairs.

In regard to the interchange of information even within denominations there is still a long way to go. American and British Congre-

gationalists profit scarcely at all by each other's experience. American Congregationalists, for example, know nothing about the Report of the recent College Commission; British Congregationalists know nothing about the American National Preaching Mission, about which Dr. C. J. McCombe writes within. In that Preaching Mission the American Churches learnt their unity; if it could be made world-wide those participating would realize they were one far more quickly than by continued controversy about Faith and Order.

In the arrangements for the International Congregational Council a real chance will be given for Congregationalists to pool their knowledge and experience, and a real effort will be made to focus Congregational opinion throughout the world on the problems of to-day. Congregationalism is particularly fortunate in that at a time when the International Council is to meet in America (at Wellesley College, June 24th-July 4th, 1940) the new Secretary of the General Council of the Congregational Churches of the U.S.A. is Dr. Douglas Horton, well-known to our readers as a member of our Editorial Board and a contributor to our pages. Dr. Horton took part of his training in England and is a constant visitor to our shores. As scholar, preacher, and writer he is held in high esteem in his own land; he comes to his new office in the prime of life, with a career which peculiarly fits him for the great tasks which await him. Before the International Council meets he will have been round the world, visiting the Madras Conference, and calling in England at Easter time on his way home. He has a "concern" to bring together in a truly effective way Congregationalists the world over, and we know no man more likely to make the dream a reality. In each number of the *Congregational Quarterly* we hope to print news about the preparation for the Council, and to serve its ends to the best of our powers.

* * *

MANY people anxious to do the right thing are asking what should be the Christian's attitude in regard to A.R.P. That attitude each must determine for himself; there is much to be said on both sides. We cannot but be disturbed, however, by the continued reiteration of the statement that war is inevitable. Bismarck used to say, "Painting the devil on the wall conjures him up", and Jules Cambon, another realist, quoting this dictum, added, "People will do so much of it that he will one day show himself".

* * *

TIME and again we have drawn attention to the possibilities of the film, and urged that the churches should make full use of the screen in worship, evangelism, and religious education. At the present time the Religious Film Society is devoting special attention to the preparation of films for religious education in day and Sunday Schools,

and all engaged in the training of the young will do well to acquaint themselves with what is being done. Meanwhile, a little book which ministers and others who want to know about films will find of practical use is the Rev. A. Douglas Wing's *Films and Faith* (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.). Mr. Wing gives details about projectors and their cost and use; Film Societies and films available; and literature generally. The book is written from the Anglican angle and it contains one or two disquieting indications that some Anglicans are not happy about an inter-denominational Film Society. We certainly hope that there will be no denominational rivalry in the use of this new instrument. We trust too that the Congregationalists will wake up; both Anglicans and Methodists have left them far behind in this field.

In a little book just published, *Followers All,* the writer, Mrs. A. M. Wilkinson, says that the cinema is probably the most universal influence in modern life. She goes on:

> The average child appears to go to the pictures twice a week from an absurdly early age. I recently gave a party to my Bible Class, twenty boys and girls between fifteen and eighteen. One of the games was to identify pictures of film stars. Half the company got a hundred per cent right, no one got less than 75 per cent. The previous Sunday not one of them admitted to having heard the story of Elijah and the prophets of Baal.

This illustration suggests in itself the challenge modern civilization presents to all engaged in the teaching of the young.

* * *

We are glad to have the Bishop of Dornakal's contradiction of the accuracy of a report of an interview with Mr. Gandhi, in which the latter is reported to have said:

> We shall not allow conversions to continue. You Christians must stop preaching to and making disciples amongst the Depressed Classes. If you do not, we shall make you. We shall appeal to the educated Indian Christians: we shall appeal to your home constituency; and if these fail we shall prohibit by law any change of religion, and will back up the law by the force of the State.

It seemed incredible that the apostle of non-resistance should have spoken thus, and it is re-assuring to have the Bishop's declaration not only that he and Mr. Gandhi agreed that no account of the interview should be published, but that "every statement—without exception—attributed to Gandhi is *wholly and absolutely untrue*".

* * *

It is often said that while Protestantism in England is decaying Roman Catholicism is growing by leaps and bounds. There is not much in this contention, as Roman Catholic writers themselves recog-

nized during the Catholic Emancipation Celebrations in 1929. Sound in its psychology as ever, the Roman Catholic Church makes great play with its converts, but says not a word about the thousands who slip out of its fold year by year. This is not to say Rome is unaware of the problem and taking no steps to solve it. A striking little book, *Christ and the Workers* (Sands, 5s.), from the pen of Mr. Stanley B. James, once a Congregational minister and now one of the "we layfolk" of the Roman Church, deserves attention. Mr. James is intent on Catholic Action as expressed in the organization of the "Young Christian Workers", a lay apostolate of young people who shall work for Catholicism as young Communists work for Communism. He quotes Marx's words, "Only the proletariat can emancipate the proletariat", and says that "Communism has compelled the Church to create a working class apostolate". Catholic Action claims at mobilizing the whole body of the laity—it is the Crusade movement of the 20th Century—always, of course, subservient to the hierarchy.

Mr. James's book is a strange mixture of obscurantism and perspicacity; he is so forward-looking that he must be careful; though he says all the proper things ("the heresiarch Wyclif"; "the sectarian bodies"; the preacher is "a commentator on what is done at the altar"—not on Calvary, be it noted) there is so much reminiscent of his old background that he may be in danger! He has, however, a concern which should occupy all the churches—the fact that the Church of Christ the Carpenter is failing to win those who worked as He did. Hugh Price Hughes used to say that the Reformation was essentially a middle-class movement and the Methodists were the first preachers to reach the working classes since the Franciscans. Are the Methodists reaching the working classes to-day? Or the Congregationalists? Or the Salvation Army? We believe Mr. James is absolutely right in calling for workers—young workers—to win for Christ their own companions: in Mr. Christopher Dawson's words: "The future of the world lies with the culture of the working class and the apostolate of the laity".

Are the Free Churches ready to learn from the Roman Catholic Church, from the Group Movement, from the Communists? Are Congregationalists prepared to see that their members are apostles and evangelists, placed by the Church in cells where they can exercise influence for Christ? Or are we content to leave the winning of the workers to others? If so, we have signed our own death-warrant and Ichabod can be written over our doors.

* * *

THE reading of the life of Bishop Taylor-Smith, of the Army, Keswick, and the Children's Special Service Mission, leads us once again to the consideration of religious terminology. If Christians

(we hope they may be allowed to consider themselves such) who do not go to Keswick are repelled by the reiterated phrases in which religion of a fundamentalist type expresses itself, how are "outsiders" impressed by it, those men and women for whom Christ died and whom it is the business of the Church to win?

Especially do we find the use of expressions about death unreal and irritating. Why are so many people afraid of saying a man has "died"? Why must they unctuously say "passed away", "received the home call", or "gone to higher service"? All the phrases are sickening euphemisms. And what does the last mean? If a man is trying to serve God with heart and mind and soul and strength, what higher service is there? Can it be wondered that rational and healthy men and women turn their backs on this sort of thing?

* * *

WOMEN are often accused of being impatient, but we confess to continual surprise at the way in which they so placidly accept the injustice and inconvenience of a man-made world. Take, for example, the limitation of the number of women students at Oxford and Cambridge. When 5,000 plus is the number of male students at Cambridge and 500 the limit on the number of women, is it any wonder the calibre of the women is much higher than that of the men? But what of the 4,500 promising girls each year denied admittance, many of whom would greatly benefit by all that Cambridge can offer? Or take the inequalities in salaries still prevalent in many fields for women doing exactly the same work as men.

Affecting a far larger number of women, however, in the inconvenience of many houses, which seem to have been constructed in the middle of the 19th century not with a view to labour saving, but to increase work, with many steps, entailing waste of time and energy. Often in houses in North-East London we have wondered why tired and jaded women did not set to work to burn the lot down: probably they were too tired and jaded to do it; probably they had lost heart and come to accept their fate as inevitable. In some of the new houses an attempt has been made to help the house-wife, but in many of them there is still much to be desired. Is it not in one of Mr. Wells's novels that the architect-builder, wishing to give his proletarian little wife the home of her dreams, asks for the first requirement, and gets the reply "Cupboards!"? When English women really wake up we shall see rapid developments. They will refuse to be slaves to their houses, employ to the full labour-saving devices, insist on communal washing and cooking where possible and under hygienic conditions which they approve (thousands of women believe that nobody is clean and careful enough to wash and cook properly but themselves)—and secure for themselves more rest and leisure.

At Bradford during the Autumnal Meetings of the Congregational Union of England and Wales there is to be a Fairbairn Centenary Celebration when Principal E. J. Price and Dr. R. S. Franks will speak, the latter on "Fairbairn's Contribution to Theology". It would be an excellent thing—perhaps better for the denomination even than new hymn books and a new system of "Settlements and Removals"—if a whole Session could be given to a comparison—perhaps "contrast" would be the better word—between Congregationalism in Bradford in Fairbairn's time and Congregationalism in Bradford to-day. Then Congregationalism counted a great deal in the life of the city; its workmen were eager to discuss questions of religion, theology, and society with the College Principal; its churches had good congregations and were progressive and alert. If a morning could be spent getting the contrast under our skins so that we might be driven to a day of humiliation and then to a new dedication, *with all that it might involve in the way of a revolution in our witness and our methods,* it would be the finest thing that has happened to Congregationalism in this century.

* * *

Some time ago the Assembly of the Congregational Union accepted a recommendation of the College Commission that the Federal Council of the Free Churches should be asked to consider the question of the training of the ministry with a view to co-operation and economy. We are eagerly awaiting information about the Council's action. Federal Councils necessarily move even more slowly than denominations—cynics will probably say that is impossible—and as yet there has been no public statement. Possibly the matter will have been discussed by the time these lines are read.

We venture to prophesy, however, that nothing effective will be done unless steady pressure comes from the churches. Thousands of pounds annually could be saved were it not for denominational pride and *amour propre.* Denominational leaders who emphasize the difficulty of getting local churches to unite should set an example in this regard. They should not be like the Methodist Circuit Steward long years ago who, having proclaimed the advantages of Methodist Union, was asked which of the four Methodist Churches in a town of 14,000 people would be closed, and replied, "Oh, it won't affect us"! What is the good of talking about Union unless practical steps be taken? A Free Church College for Lancashire, one for Yorkshire, one in Oxford, one in Cambridge, one in South Wales, one in London, and one, let us say, in the Midlands and one in the West, all of them attached to Universities—is not this the ideal method of training ministers for the Free Churches? But that means eight Colleges instead of two dozen or so in existence at present. Will the Federal Council be able—and will it dare if it is

able?—to tell the churches how much is being spent on the training of the ministry to-day, and how much could be saved if co-operation were made a reality? If the churches had to raise all the money now spent, there would be an outcry at once; religious people should be as scrupulous in using money handed down to them from the past as in using that which they themselves raise. Let the Colleges lead the way to union—it is surely their duty and their privilege so to do, even though it means much sacrifice.

* * *

WHILE these pages are in the press there appears *Albert Spicer, 1847-1934: A Man of His Time* (Simpkin Marshall, 3s. 6d.) by "One of his Family". Having suffered much from filial biographers, we opened the beautifully produced "unconventional essay in biography" in some trepidation, to find it delightfully successful. The rest of the ten children of Sir Albert Spicer must be grateful to the eleventh for painting this portrait—so human and humorous, so sympathetic and yet critical. Happily divided into "Religion", "Politics", "Business", and "Family Life", the writer surveys the activities of one who will always be esteemed in Congregational circles for his work and witness. The account of the way Spicer and his family took control of the local Congregational churches where they were on holiday is true to life; we like the incident where, annoyed to find his hat dusty at the end of the service, he turns the other cheek by putting an extra gift in the collection box at the door in an envelope on which he had written "Towards the expenses of cleaning the church". Equally characteristic and amusing is his effort to discover how many mangel-wurzels a cow eats in a day!

It only remains to say that the pages on family life will remain on record as a picture of a well-to-do Nonconformist home in the Victorian and post-Victorian period. Not for the first time, by the way, does the name "Haworth" present a stumbling block to the Southerner.

In the *Memoir* is one sentence which should give pause to all Free Churchmen. The writer remarks that the Spicers have for generations been Congregationalists, but that now the tradition "is showing signs of decay". This is typical of what is happening in many families, and we are constrained to ask why it is that so many educated Christians, not merely Congregationalists, cease their religious profession as the years go by. This presents one of the greatest challenges to the Church of our time—how to present the Christian apologetic in a way that will convince people of education and learning. Are we satisfied that the training received by students for the ministry is such as will enable them to give an account for the faith that is in them in a way that will make university professors, say, inclined to examine the whole question afresh for themselves?

PERHAPS one reason why the Churches fail to hold such people is suggested by Lord Horder's remark:

> "The apotheosis of Obscurantism still persists in the creed attributed to Athanasius".

It always seems to us particularly unfortunate that the Creeds on which so much stress is laid by some of the Churches contain ambiguity in their very names. The Apostles had nothing to do with the Apostles' Creed, Nicea has no connection with the Nicene Creed, and Athanasius must be surprised when he hears—if ever he does—the Creed which bears his name. "Ambiguity" is, of course, a mild word: the enemies of Christianity would say, of course, that the continued use of such misleading names is less than honest. And when they find that the Group Movement, which proclaims the need of absolute honesty, clings to the name "Oxford" to which it has no shadow of a right, they harden their hearts—and who shall blame them?

* * *

MAY we commend to the attention of readers the laudable enterprise on which the Rev. C. E. Surman, of Reading, is engaged—the preparation of a "Directory of Congregational Biography", which will include all ministers since 1662 with the churches they have served?

Such a Directory will be a great boon to students, but its compilation is beyond the power of a single man. Many students are assisting Mr. Surman, but required information is often hidden in out-of-the-way places. Will ministers and church secretaries who read these pages send to the Rev. C. E. Surman, B.A., 96 Crescent Road, Reading, any lists of ministers, printed or manuscript, which they possess? And in case of any inquiry from him, will they please respond as speedily as possible?

An account of the project for the Directory appears in the current issue of the *Transactions* of the Congregational Historical Society, just published. That issue also contains an account by Mr. David Chamberlin of the re-housing of the records of the London Missionary Society, now being carried out by the aid of a grant from the Pilgrim Trust; a study of "Bishop Pecock and the Lollard Movement" by the Rev. Geoffrey F. Nuttall; a history of Llanvaches, "the First Independent Church in Wales", by the Rev. T. Mardy Rees and of Sherwell Sunday School, Plymouth, by Mr. Stanley Griffin. There are also extracts from the Minute Book of the Tollesbury Congregational Church. Copies of the *Transactions* are sent to all members of the Society. The annual subscription is 5/- a year, and the Treasurer Mr. R. H. Muddiman: this membership is open to churches as well as individuals, and every church ought to become a corporate member. It would greatly help the Society in its work if Congregationalists and others were to become Life Members: the

subscription is £5 5s. 0d., of which £4 4s. 0d. is placed in a Capital Fund.

* * *

No one of our Pilgrim Fathers had a more attractive character than William Bradford, whose *History of the Plimoth Plantation* is as moving as the *Acts of the Apostles*. It has long been assumed that the "Manor House" at Austerfield was the birth place and early home of Bradford, but no evidence for this tradition has been forthcoming. Recent investigation seems to show that Robert Bradford, William's uncle, who died in 1609, lived in a house which was still in the occupation of the Bradford family in 1767. William's father died when he was a year old, and Cotton Mather states that he was brought up by his grandfather and uncles. It is extremely probable, therefore, that he lived in this house, and a fund is being raised for its purchase. $7,500 has been collected in America, and £400 is needed from this country.

* * *

THE Halley Stewart Lectures will be given this year by Professor John Hilton of Cambridge. Professor Hilton has won a great reputation as a broadcast commentator on the problems of everyday life, and he is assured of a great audience for his lectures. They will be delivered in the Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, on the five Tuesdays in November at 6 p.m.

* * *

CANON HODGSON, the Secretary of the Edinburgh Conference, has edited the Report, now published under the title, *The Second World Conference on Faith and Order, Edinburgh, 1937* (S.C.M., 10s. 6d.). This volume will take its place in the rapidly growing collection of books and documents dealing with Church Union. It is to be hoped that the attention of Christians in all the Churches will be directed to this Report: the gulf between those who take part in these discussions and the individual church and church members is still so wide that much education is needed. Especially in view of the proposed World Council is it necessary that such education should be taken in hand in each denomination.

* * *

THE Index for 1938 (Vol. XVI) is ready, and copies may be obtained from Independent Press, who will also supply binding cases.

* * *

GEMS from Maisie Ward, *The Wilfrid Wards and the Transition*.

Lord Hartington had come in very hungry after a long day of committee work and was very obviously dissatisfied with the unsubstantial French dishes which were placed before him, so much so that he would hardly speak at all in reply to his hostess's observations. When a joint of roast beef at last appeared he said in a deep

voice, "Hurrah, something to eat at last", and from that time onward thawed and was agreeable enough. But so deep an impression had the unsatisfactory nature of the first courses made on him that when I met him eighteen years later at the British Embassy in Rome and reminded him of the place of our former meeting, he at once said, "Of course, I remember it, we had nothing to eat".

Of Jowett of Balliol.

I heard that about a year before he died he had a scruple that he had been too cold to some of his relations, whom he had kept rather at a distance. Several of them were therefore invited to come and take leave of him, as he was not expected to recover. He used to get worse towards night, and they gathered round the bedside to see the last of him. On one occasion he beckoned to the nearest, and said to him in a faint and bored voice: "Tell them they need not stay. I don't think I shall do *anything definite* to-night".

One picture that my mother drew of herself and Theresa dwells in my memory: a long walk over the forest, a lonely cottage and a dying baby. The only other person in the cottage was an old Baptist woman who seemed to have been left in charge; she said the child must wait to decide when grown up if it wanted baptism.

"But it can never grow up. It's dying."

Theresa and Josephine did not hesitate; one got water while the other held back the old woman. And the baby was made safe for Heaven.

This talk between Tennyson and Wilfrid Ward took place a few weeks after my birth. Delightful as a study of contrasts was the poet's next meeting with my mother:

"Well", he said, "we've both been ill, but you've got something to show for it, I haven't".

I was then produced, and the proud parents awaited a compliment.

"She's exactly like Henry the Eighth", was all they got.

* * *

After the reference to American newspapers at the beginning of these notes we must not accept without reserve any statements we read in them. And we trust there is no foundation for an account of an "ingenious scheme to raise money for a church"—a "hugging social", even though the *Reader's Digest*, under the heading "The Personal Touch", gives it its authority, quoting it from the *Sylvan Valley News* (N.C.) *via* the *Asheville Citizen-Times*:

> About 500 people were present and a nice amount was raised for the church. The schedule of prices for the event was: Two-minute hug, 15 cents; 15-to-25 minute hug, 50 cents; another man's wife, $1; old maids and no time limit, three cents. The young ladies of the church want to give another social to clear the church debt, but the older members protest.

ANDREW MARTIN FAIRBAIRN, 1838-1938.

By Dr. W. B. Selbie.

On November 4th, 1838, Andrew Martin Fairbairn was born at Inverkeithing in Fifeshire, and the centenary of his birth may well be made a fit occasion for attempting to estimate the value of his work and the debt which many still living owe to him.

All over the world there are men occupying positions of influence and usefulness who look back to Fairbairn and his teaching as the chief formative influence in their lives. There are many others who, though they never had personal relations with him, yet remember with gratitude the steadying and inspiring influence he exerted among the Free Churches at a time of doubt, transition, and drift. To the people called Independents, in particular, his teaching was a boon, for it helped to make easier the change over from a rather narrow type of Calvinism to a broader, saner, more historical, more liberal, and more liveable faith. There was always something of *Sturm und Drang* about Fairbairn's defence and exposition of Christianity which reflected the struggles through which he had himself passed in order to win his way to the light. There was always about his presentation of the faith an air of triumph and assurance and a large tolerance of spirit which made it very attractive to younger men who were still feeling the heat and burden of the fight.

Fairbairn was a thorough Scot and had all a Scotsman's love for the intricacies of philosophical and theological speculation. But he was brought up in a narrow atmosphere and nursed in a rigid creed. During the early years of his ministry at Bathgate his faith fell from him like ill-fitting armour to which he had never really been accustomed. He abandoned the ministry for the time being and, as he says, "In a mood compounded partly of hope but largely of despair, I determined to seek abroad the light I could not find at home. Well do I remember the day when, feeling cheerless, forsaken of God, unpitied and unblest of men, I left the Manse to take my way to Germany, never expecting to return". Thus it was that Germany became in a very real sense his spiritual home. But it was a very different Germany from that which we know to-day—a land where a very beautiful piety went hand in hand with deep speculation and bold but reverent criticism. There Fairbairn learnt with a somewhat *naïve* astonishment that it was no sin to doubt or to inquire, that faith was a bigger thing than dogma, and that the God of predestination and the divine decrees was a different being from the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. So he found again not the faith which he had lost, but a new and larger faith, more intellectually satisfying and spiritually fruitful. In his relief and gratitude he dug

himself in, as it were, and if he never advanced far beyond the position he reached in Germany, it was because he found there what satisfied his deepest needs—a theology that he could impart and a Gospel that he could preach.

Shortly after his return from Germany he published his first book, *Studies in the Philosophy of Religion and History*. In some respects it is the most original of his writings, and it struck the keynote of much of his future work. He had discovered that there were other great religions in the world beside Christianity, and he urged that "he who would maintain the Christian must be just and even generous to all the religions created and professed by man." Thus he became in this country a pioneer in advocating the comparative study of religions as the best means to a true understanding and orientation of Christianity. In this he was greatly influenced by Hegel's *Philosophy of Religion*, and by the work of the Tübingen School. Though he was not a Hegelian in the strict sense, he never himself advanced far beyond the Hegelian position and quite failed to appreciate its development in Ritschl and his followers. He disliked the philosophy which underlay their attitude to Christian doctrine, and said, "This philosophy is as marked a retrogression from the standpoint and spirit of the older German schools as the Ritschlian historical method is an advance on that alike of Berlin and Tübingen". To Fairbairn any true philosophy of religion must also be a philosophy of history and of human life. So he argued:

> No philosophy of history is possible without a patient and sufficient study of the facts and phenomena of mind, individual and collective. Speculation must build on the solid rock of reality if it is to build into heaven and for eternity.

Here, again, is a very characteristic position. Fairbairn's theology was always rooted in experience. But to him experience was no mere castle in the air, but the reflection of God's Word and work in history and in the lives and hearts of men. Hence the apologetic with which he faced the agnosticism and materialism of his time was more than a dialectic exercise. It was the witness of a living faith to the being and actions of a living God. In his lectures to working men and students at Aberdeen, Bradford, and later at Oxford, some of his best work was done. I well remember their quickening and steadying effect on men like myself who came to them fresh from the rather arid and negative discipline of the Oxford Greats School. They opened our eyes to a new world, to a theology which might well be called the queen of the sciences, to a Christianity, historically verifiable and philosophically defensible, and to a faith both experimental and rational. One could not but admire the passionate earnestness of this great teacher who seemed to have all learning for his province, who could breathe life into the driest bones of theology,

and who was able to impart to others his own touchingly simple faith in Jesus Christ, the Son of God and Saviour of men.

Thus it was quite in character that the subject of his next great book should be *The Place of Christ in Modern Theology*. Had this book been issued ten years earlier, as it very well might have been, it would have deserved the much abused epithet "epoch-making". As it was, it marked an epoch and was everywhere welcomed as a most timely and brilliant contribution to a positive theology. It is timely even for our day, and I can imagine no better discipline for a budding theologian than to read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest it. Even in the matter of Biblical criticism, in which great advances have been made recently and in regard to which Fairbairn was always somewhat conservative, the book is not wholly negligible. There are some anticipations of later ideas, familiar enough now, but much less so when the book was written. There is still a good deal to be learned from Fairbairn's discussion of the New Testament Christologies as reflections of the thought of the Church in its various phases. But the most valuable part of the book is its presentation of the history of Christian thought from the beginning as the necessary background for any modern reconstruction. Fairbairn paints always with a broad brush and on a big canvas, and there is something very impressive in the sweep and range of his discussions. And his treatment of the history is not merely critical. It is constructive as well, and contains the germs of that positive re-statement to which it is the necessary preliminary. The complaint that the constructive endeavour, when we come to it, is not always adequate, hardly takes account of the fact that in Fairbairn's hands the history itself is made to serve a positive and constructive purpose. In his treatment of it he always has a philosophy of history in mind. To him history is a pointer to the ways of God with men and an indispensable safeguard against rash generalizations and unfounded theorizing.

On the strictly theological side Fairbairn in this and other books elaborates a doctrine of the Fatherhood of God as determinative of all our thought concerning Him. To call God Father is not to say that He is no longer creator, sovereign, and judge, but rather that all His relations with men are governed and guided by His fatherly love and care. It is His love for men that makes possible the Christian view of human nature, enhances the sinfulness of sin, and requires and conditions the redemptive work of Jesus Christ. Though he uses the language of the older theology, Fairbairn strips it of its artificiality in the treatment of the divine attributes. There is something very human and simple about his thought on these great themes. He brings theology down not so much to the market-place as to the home, and insists that it must be interpreted and re-stated in the language of every-day life. His defence of this position is

worth quoting and has a very real message for our time:

> We all feel the distance placed by fifty years of the most radical and penetrating critical discussions between us and the older theology, and as the distance widens the theology that then reigned grows less credible because less relevant to living mind. Does this mean that the days of definite theological beliefs are over, or not rather that the attempt ought to be made to re-state them in more living and relevant terms? One thing seems clear: if a Christian theology means a theology of Christ, at once concerning Him and derived from Him, then to construct one ought, because of our greater knowledge of Him and His history, to be more possible to-day than at any previous moment. And if this is clear, then the most provisional attempt at performing the possible is more dutiful than the selfish and idle acquiescence that would simply leave the old theology and the new criticism standing side by side unrelated and unreconciled.

Fairbairn had planned to write a comprehensive Philosophy of Religion, or of Religions, but the only part of the plan which he carried out was his *Philosophy of the Christian Religion*—the last fruit of the old tree. He describes it in the Preface as follows:

> This book is neither a Philosophy nor a History of Religion, but it is an endeavour to look at what is at once the central fact and idea of the Christian faith by a mind whose chief labour in life has been to make an attempt at such a philosophy through such a history.

This again is very characteristic, for it was the writer's conviction that religion is so closely bound up with all man's life and interests that it can never be studied as a thing apart. Hence the importance of history and the conclusion that a Philosophy of Religion must be also a Philosophy of history and of life. "For unless Religion be an eternal challenge to the reason it can have no voice for the imagination and no value for the heart". Thus this book also has a very real apologetic value. It was one of the earliest attempts to make use of the researches of anthropologists into primitive religion, and it well illustrates Fairbairn's repeated contention that the lower religions must be interpreted always in the light of the higher and not *vice versa*. The importance of this principle is even more obvious to-day than when Fairbairn wrote. Of the book as a whole the judgment which Dr. Denney passed upon it still holds good. "*The Philosophy of the Christian Religion*", he wrote,

> is a truly great book, rich, comprehensive and profound. It is something to find at the present moment, when a species of theological positivism is threatening everywhere to dissolve the connection of religion with reason, that there is a man among us who does not despair of the intelligence which God has given and is not afraid of the combination of ideas expressed in the

> title of this book. More than anything which Principal Fairbairn has yet written it may be said to represent the ripe fruit of his life's work. It is full of knowledge, experience, reflection, criticism. There is a largeness of mind in it answering to the greatness of the subjects treated which grows upon the reader and makes him slow to dissent: and it is animated throughout by that moral passion without which it is impossible to think to purpose about a moral world.

But it is time now to turn from theology to other aspects of Fairbairn's activity. Foremost among these was the work he did for the education of the ministry. From the time that he left Aberdeen to become Principal of Airedale College, Bradford, this was one of his main interests, and he devoted himself to it with great energy and insight. To him more than to any other one man is due the great advance in theological teaching which has come about during the last fifty years. He set a great example himself at Airedale and later at Mansfield. He made it his business to train theological teachers, and his constant advocacy of higher standards gradually produced a change in all the colleges, of both the Congregational and Baptist denominations. His success may be measured by the fact that no less than nine of his pupils became heads of theological colleges, and several others professors or teachers in them. He was also mainly instrumental in establishing and organizing theological degrees in the Welsh Universities, and at Manchester. It was sometimes felt, indeed, that in this matter his zeal tended to outrun discretion. He was very critical of antiquated methods and ideals and did not hesitate to say so, and sometimes gave needless offence by his rather dictatorial tone. At Oxford, for example, he went so far as to publish a pamphlet criticizing severely the curriculum of the Theological School and making definite suggestions for its reform. It was a very able document and contained a well-thought-out scheme. But it fell on deaf ears. Some resented it as an impertinence. Others felt that it savoured too much of Scottish and German University methods. Oxford teachers in those days were very unwilling to listen to suggestions from outside, and Fairbairn was never given any part in administering the theological work of the University.

This, however, does not mean that Fairbairn did not have a very powerful influence on the Oxford of his time. His great achievement was, of course, the founding and fostering of Mansfield College. It was a most difficult and delicate task. How difficult and how delicate those who have only known post-war Oxford cannot possibly imagine. Fairbairn brought to it a very rare combination of qualities, and succeeded as probably no other man then living could have done. He was determined to build up an institution which both in

form and spirit should be worthy of the place. How well he succeeded the last 50 years have abundantly shown. His main interest, of course, was the training of men for the Free Church ministry. His own experience had made him very conscious of the intellectual difficulties then confronting the churches, and he foresaw that they were likely to increase rather than diminish. He realized, too, the need there was in those days for a keener social conscience among Christians, but he had no use for zeal without knowledge. To him the great desideratum of the time was a better educated ministry. Writing on this subject in 1895 he said:

> It is our duty to make our faith credible to living minds, reasonable first to our own reason and then to the reasons we seek to persuade. No man or church has any right to ask men to believe what they cannot rationally conceive, or what contradicts ascertained and certain truths. If the truths of religion are eternal they must be in harmony with the no less eternal truths of nature and mind: and this harmony it is the business of the religious teacher to prove.

This, again, does not mean that Fairbairn's outlook on the ministry was purely intellectualist. Outsiders might think that he was concerned to fill pulpits with high-brows, but nothing could be further from the truth. He had himself had experience of pastoral work both in country and town, and he freely shared it with his students. He never lost sight of the fact that the ministry is a cure of souls and that preaching is only one side of the many-sided work. He constantly laid stress on the need for simplicity and human sympathy in the preaching of the Word. The message ought to be delivered in such a way as to be intelligible and welcome to the simplest and most unlearned. But this would mean close study and hard work, and nothing roused Fairbairn's righteous indignation so surely as slipshod and lazy sermonizing. He had a very high ideal of the ministry and did his best to ensure that his men should live up to it.

Fairbairn was throughout his life a consistent and whole-hearted Dissenter or Nonconformist. But he did not like these negative designations and preferred Free Churchman or Independent. He spoke of himself as a dependent independent—dependent always upon God but independent as regards man. In Scotland he had belonged to the Evangelical Union, which was always regarded by the dominant Presbyterianism as the very dissidence of dissent. Coming to England he found the transition to Congregationalism quite easy. He threw himself whole-heartedly into the life and work of the Congregational Churches and made their cause his own. Both by his pen and by word of mouth he did more than any man, with the possible exception of Dr. Dale, to make the Free Churches

conscious of their calling and their message, and to remind Congregationalists of the spiritual foundations of their polity. He writes, for example:

> The ultimate grounds, I will not say of our Nonconformity, but of our existence as Free Churches of Jesus Christ are theological and religious, not political. Our reasons for dissenting from the Church of England are too fundamental to be merely or mainly ecclesiastical. We dissent because we believe that she fails adequately to interpret and realize for the people of England the religion of Christ.

And, again:

> The Congregational system or ideal is not a theory of church politics or government, but fundamentally a doctrine of religion, a way of apprehending and realizing the Christian faith. Its ecclesiastical polity is but its doctrine applied to the exercise and cultivation of the religious life. Catholicism is a splendid system even without the religious idea that fills it; but Independency, apart from its religious basis and ideal, is at once mean and impotent, impracticable and visionary. Our Fathers held that legislation, civil or ecclesiastical, could not create a Church. Conversion and converted men alone could. All were kings and priests unto God and could exercise their functions only as they stood in open and immediate relations with Him. In His Church Christ did not reign while officials governed. He both governed and reigned.

This high doctrine of the Church Fairbairn always maintained and defended. Though ecclesiastical controversy was little to his taste, he always felt bound to oppose the doctrine of a State Church and all the claims and pretensions that followed with it. Like many others of his time he held the mistaken belief that Disestablishment was within the realm of practical politics and not far distant. It was a cause which he felt bound to support in the interests of true religion.

Fairbairn was attracted to English Congregationalists also by their zeal for education—another cause very dear to his heart. His experience in Scotland made it difficult for him to understand the dual system in this country, and he never agreed with Dr. Dale and others who advocated what was called the secular solution, by which all religious teaching would be excluded from the State schools. The position was perhaps a logical one, but there was no strong public opinion behind it, and it would have meant putting on the Churches a burden which they were quite unwilling to bear. Fairbairn believed that it was the duty of the State to teach religion, but not in the interests of any one Church or denomination. When, therefore, the Balfour Bill of 1902 proposed to subsidize Anglican schools out of the rates, Fairbairn took a very active part in the fight against it. He wrote a long memorandum on the subject which Lord Bryce

described as "one of the finest State papers of our time", and he headed a deputation to the Prime Minister and set forth the Nonconformist objections to the Bill with unanswerable logic. It was all in vain, however, and when the Act had been passed Fairbairn both by his voice and pen supported those who thought it well to register their opposition to it by what was known as Passive Resistance. His attitude on this whole question was dictated not merely by the interests of the Free Churches, though he recognized that they had a real grievance, but by the claim of citizens to equal treatment under the law, and privilege for none. This position he worked out with great amplitude and skill in many writings and public addresses.

Some of these were collected in the volume entitled *Catholicism, Roman and Anglican,* published in 1899. It is the most controversial of all Fairbairn's works, but it met a felt need at the time and it is still both timely and relevant. It may be doubted, indeed, whether Protestants quite realize what a redoubtable champion their cause has in this ardent little Scotsman. He states the case against Catholic authoritarianism in all its forms with an irresistible logic and with a wealth of historical illustration. His treatment is the more effective because it is not merely that of an English Nonconformist, but of a man whose sole interest is to defend the freedom and spirituality of the Christian faith against those who would bind it in ecclesiastical forms. He says:

> The Church lives and moves and has its being in Christ: but the Churches have as conditions of their being what used to be called the pure Word of God and the Sacraments. We are strictly within the lines of historical truth when we say that without the Word no Church can come into being, and without it none can continue. Every Apostolic Church was created by the preaching of the Word and lived only as the creative became the preservative agency. As to the Sacraments we shall only say, once they became the acts and instruments of a priest they lost their original sense and were changed from the possessions and seals and symbols of the community into the appendices and articles of an office. The most inveterate schismatic is the person and the party that draws round himself or itself a circle and says—within this is the sphere of God's covenanted mercies: all without it is the region of the uncovenanted. We are the Catholic Church: all beyond is the province of the sectaries and the sects. There is nothing in all history so intensely schismatic as this pseudo-Catholicism, it is the vanity of the sectary in its worst possible form. And those who believe that the Church of God is as broad and free as the mercy of God may well be forgiven if they speak plainly and frankly about any attempt to bind it to a provincial polity and to make it seem less large and gracious than the action of God in history has proved it to be.

This long quotation may be excused because it shows so clearly how strong was Fairbairn's hostility to every form of sacerdotalism. There was a streak of Puritan intolerance in his nature. It comes out in his treatment of Newman and his friends, and sometimes clouds his judgment in spite of his efforts to be scrupulously fair. But he had good grounds for his position. He could not understand how men could be so blind to the teaching of history and so ready in the interests of tradition and orthodoxy to tamper with the truth. His defence of a reasoned faith was greatly needed in his own day, and the need for it has not lessened with the advancing years.

In conclusion, what are we to say about the man himself? His was no doubt a most arresting personality. One recalls with affection and not without some amusement the familiar sight of him as he confronted an audience. His stocky frame with its firm foursquare stance, with head thrown back and hands clasped in front of him bespoke a man who was master at once of himself, of his subject, and of the situation. His voice was harsh, rising sometimes almost to a scream, and his style involved, florid, and teasingly antithetical. He would begin slowly, almost hesitatingly, feeling his way round his subject before settling down to it. Then, as he warmed to his theme, he would work up his message in glowing words and close with a burst of eloquence that carried all before it like a river in spate. At his best he was a grand speaker and drove his message home with the skill of an advocate and the zeal of a prophet. As a preacher he was sometimes too subtly theological for the average hearer, but he could also be quite simply evangelical with a truly pastoral solicitude for the needs of his audience. He used sometimes to preach to the East coast fishermen in their little Methodist Chapels when on holiday, and one of them once said of him, "He did talk to we like an angel".

But it is as a friend and teacher that some of us remember him best. With all his multifarious interests and engagements he never forgot his main business—the training of men for the Christian ministry, and he gave himself to his students without stint. In lectures and sermons and in private talk he kept before his students a high ideal of sacred learning and of the pastoral office. He loved sincerity, simplicity, and singleness of purpose, but he scorned pretentious ignorance and slipshod reasoning. He could be very caustic in criticism and bitter in denunciation, but all with a kindly concern that robbed his harshest words of their sting. To men in any doubt or trouble he was a real friend, wise in counsel, patient in rebuke, and eager to help where help was most needed. As Dr. Sanday says,

> Take him for all in all he was an impressive figure, a strong man such as the north country breeds: of deep family affections, a good friend and a redoubtable foe; staunch to the core, robust

> beyond all common measure of robustness: bearing a load of multifarious learning almost unique in certain directions: master of a fervid Scottish rhetoric, perhaps somewhat diffuse and somewhat apt to be carried away by the jingle of verbal antithesis, but in single paragraphs and sentences often hitting the mark with nervous strokes of elemental force and power. At any time such a man would have been a great gift to the causes that he championed, and at the particular time at which he lived he carried several of those causes through a period of transition that might well have proved too much for shoulders weaker than his own and landed them in safety with all the promise of permanence and expansion.

These are true words, and may well serve to crown our tribute to one of God's great fighters in the cause of true religion and sound learning.

Religion in Essence and Manifestation. By Dr. G. VAN DER LEEUW. Allen & Unwin 25s

This is a translation by Prof. J. E. Turner, of Liverpool, of Dr. van der Leeuw's book on the Phenomenology of Religion first published in 1930. The translation is very well done, and has been made possible by the generosity of the Sir Halley Stewart Trust. The book itself is practically an encyclopædia of religion. It illustrates in the most striking way the new and wider orientation of the subject which has been made possible by modern advances in the study of Comparative Religion, in anthropology, and in psychology. It is, too, admirably documented and enriched by innumerable quotations from the relevant literature of all countries. It is the kind of book which makes it a little difficult to see the wood for the trees, but at least two main ideas emerge in the course of the discussion. These are, first, that religion is power, and, secondly, that the power in question is God, the Divine activity, the creator and sustainer of all things. While the author has a great deal to say about the infinitely varied religious ideas and experiences of men, his book as a whole is a convincing refutation of the modern tendency to make religion a wholly subjective thing, the emanation of man's consciousness and needs. This, therefore, is a book which no student of religion can afford to neglect.

W. B. SELBIE.

WHAT OF COLLECTIVE SECURITY?[1]

By Raymond Gram Swing.

To-night, as we meet here together, two terrible wars are being fought, and all the major nations of the world, our own included, are diverting a large proportion of their labour from the creation of wealth to making the implements of war. A million, probably, are already dead in China, and many millions of homes have had to be abandoned, because they lie in the path of war; tens of thousands of homes have been blotted out by bombs from the air; and thousands of homes have been entered by visiting death, which in this war takes civilians as well as organized fighters. To-night in Spain the scene is the same, and even more terrible, because the Spanish war has brought its nearly a million deaths to a population of only thirty millions, and the fighting there is to some degree between members of the same nationality and even of the same families. Also it is more terrible because this war is close to the heart of our Western civilization, and the governments of Italy and Germany are taking an official part in it, trying to decide for the Spanish people who shall rule over them, and being guided not by the desires of the Spanish people but by reasons of their own power in the world. The Spanish war is ending its second year, after establishing a record, in the wars of recent centuries, for ferocity, brutality, and fatality. Now it may run its course through a third year, and since it is a disease that lies so close to the heart of our Western civilization another year of it may attack that heart itself.

In less than two years, nearly two million human beings have been killed in wars. I throw these words at you—two millions—knowing they cannot hurt you as they should, because none of us is able to open his mind to a million or two million, or even a few thousand deaths. Which of us can imagine the reality of one day's bombing of Canton or Alicante? How are we to recreate in our own consciousnesses the stark, grim fate that lies concealed in a casualty list of a Chinese or Spanish battle, of the thousands of slain, and what life meant to them and what their lives meant to those who loved them? And I do not speak of our incapacity to know as though to imply a criticism. It is well for us that we cannot know. But in our not knowing, we owe it to ourselves at least to be aware that these things are there, in our world of to-day, and that we must take account of them in the abstract, since we are incapable of the suffering which would come from knowing them too concretely. Indeed, it

[1] It is not our custom to print speeches, but we gladly make an exception of this address, delivered by Mr. Raymond Gram Swing to the General Council of Congregational and Christian Churches at Beloit on Saturday, June 18th. Mr. Swing stopped at Chicago on his way to Beloit to give one of the weekly broadcasts on American affairs which have made his name and his voice so familiar in Britain.—Editor.

is in a sense a privilege that we can be spared the suffering of knowing more. But we are entitled to that privilege only if we will devote our most earnest effort to study this world in which we live and learn from it, in the hope that in the end we can guide our lives as individuals and communities and nations to the ways of peace.

When we look on this world in the abstract, we can see that it has not reached its present state illogically. It is a world that human beings have made, and this generation of Americans must not be blind to the truth that it has had its part in making it. We have been part of the world ever since the American nation was born. The very birth of America was made easier by the fact that our war of independence fitted into the European struggle for power. Not many years later we could not escape the backwash of the Napoleonic period. And whatever the formula which brought us into the World War, we came in because we could not withstand the pull of the forces which bind us to and with the rest of the world. These forces are not merely economic, as one theory has it; nor merely emotional, as another theory has it. The world is shrinking in size, and Europe is far closer to us to-day than Chicago was to New York a century ago. So we were part of the world in 1914, really without realizing it, and a good many Americans have yet to get over their resentment at the discovery.

At that time the peace of Europe was being maintained by a system called the Balance of Power. It had kept the peace between the Great Powers for forty years. And each of the Great Powers which was essential to that balance had to maintain, too, an internal balance, which was just as essential to the total scheme of peace. That is to say, the forty years' peace of the nineteenth century was dependent on the security of government in Britain, France, Germany, Austria, Italy, and Russia, and this in turn depended on a balance of the social forces in each of those countries. The balance began to become precarious some time before the critical hours of 1914. Russia could not hope to maintain for long the arrogant dominance of its Czaristic autocracy. Growing racial passions were threatening the strength of Austria. Even Great Britain was in the throes of a bloodless social revolution in introducing its first social insurance schemes, while the paternalistic *régime* of Germany could only hold its own by continual concessions to its growing industrial population.

The world war finally broke the vessel of peace at its weakest point, Austria, and what we need to bear in mind, if we are to understand the world of to-day, is that the Balance of Power was upset because the social balance in the parts which comprised the system of peace was disintegrating. Only strong governments can make a strong peace. The great war was a by-product, if you wish to see it

that way, of the workings of social change among the great peoples of our civilization. And having its origins in new social aspirations and new needs, the world war set to work a ferment of what, for want of a better term, is called idealism. The Balance of Power had failed; not only that, it seemed impossible to re-establish. And idealism promptly proposed its alternative, a system which should not be a Balance of Power but an Unbalance, a system which in time came to be known as collective security. It was unbalance because peace should be preserved through the massing of all governments against any single government which sought to violate its neighbour.

I am not going to review the history of the League of Nations. But I do remind you that the best and the most thinking about a system of collective security came from this country. It came not from Woodrow Wilson alone. It came not from Democrats alone. It rose naturally from decades of American thought. It was non-partisan. The League to Enforce Peace, which was founded in this country, had ex-President Taft as its President. It was simply good Americanism in 1917 to prefer a system of collective security to a system which left human destiny in the hands of such governments as that of the Kaiser of Germany and the Czar of Russia. Even after the war, and Woodrow Wilson's defeat by a minority of the Senate —and he was only beaten by a minority—when Harding ran for President scores of leading Republicans issued an assurance to the American electorate, on the eve of the election, promising that a vote for Harding would not mean a vote against the League.

The League of Nations did not fail because it was a system of collective security. That needs to be said over and over again. At the beginning it was not a world system, since the United States, Russia, and Germany were not part of it. It never could be a real world system so long as the United States remained out. And then, it never was a true system of collective security. It was one of the most baleful compromises that human beings have ever adopted. It was hitched to the Treaty of Versailles like a trailer to a motor-car. It was collective enforcement of that Versailles Treaty, and obviously the collective action could never be more valid than the Treaty which it was to enforce. That is to say that the trailer could not have been promoted to become the driving force—with an engine put in it—and the Versailles Treaty might not, in fact, have been progressively modified. We stayed out of the League, but it is one of those strange myths that grow until they swallow up the minds of a nation that as a people we *chose* to stay out. We were manœuvred by a small minority so that we never entered. Wilson, by a fatal miscalculation, made a party issue out of the Peace Treaty. Then the Republican minority proposed reservations to the League Covenant which Wilson rejected. But even if we had gone into the League

with the Lodge reservations, that surely would have been accepted as the minimum of what the entire American people wanted. And once in the League we could have used our influence within it, as later we did outside it, to modify the harshness of the Treaty of Versailles, and so make it less and less the provocation to revolt and defiance which it became.

The first crisis of the League as an instrument of collective security came over Manchuria. By that time the early post-war idealism had been badly tarnished. The League no longer clearly expressed the world's aspiration to peace, and it was obvious that the chief governments which comprised the League—and it never has been more than a collection of governments—were not imbued with any loyalty to its idealistic principles. The French were the ones who put the trailer behind the motor-car, for the Treaty of Versailles promised to give them a generation of supreme military power on the continent of Europe. The British were sceptical of the League and lukewarm in their avowals of faith. With the United States absent, they saw too many difficulties ahead in enforcing even an otherwise effective and sound League policy to maintain peace. And it is a special modern tragedy that when the ambitions of military Japan came to a focus the Japanese could weigh the League, and give it a precise and low mark as a world force. France was not going to ask for trouble in the Far East; the United States was obsessed by the great depression, and satisfied to stay out of foreign troubles. Great Britain had committed its foreign policy to Sir John Simon, the lawyer who could be trusted to make out the most erudite case for the most deficient cause. But there were stronger potentialities in Britain and the United States than were displayed by Sir John Simon's personality in Whitehall and America's absence from the League. And it is a near thing—one of the chapters of fascinating personal history—that Sir John and Secretary Stimson did not pull together to give the Anglo-Saxon nations a co-ordinated policy of objection to the Japanese aggression. This chance may have been lost partly because the talks between Sir John and Mr. Stimson were by trans-Atlantic telephone, the first time this modern invention was used for grave international questions. Sir John, like most English statesmen of to-day, was not used to talking over the telephone. And he couldn't understand very well. The trans-Atlantic service was not as reliable then as it is to-day. And Sir John had no secretary listening with him to take notes of the talks so that he could study them afterwards. Mr. Stimson was at home on a telephone, and he knew what he was saying and what it meant. I don't know how much the telephone can be blamed for the failure of those somewhat tenuous negotiations. And I should not wish to write history on the basis of a merely mechanical explanation.

But I think it is true that Secretary Stimson, with President Hoover behind him, was ready for joint action with Great Britain at that time, the ultimate scope of which they may not even have defined to themselves. The American fleet had finished its manœuvres in the Pacific, and it was ordered to remain based on Honolulu, a fact which, I believe, Mr. Stimson mentioned to Sir John in one of his talks. But the British never quite gathered that the United States was ready to do anything emphatic. Nor did the British Cabinet as a whole ever decide to reject the American proposal, such as it was. Somewhere the American initiative was lost, perhaps in the upper ranges of the ether over the Atlantic Ocean, perhaps in the upper ranges of the ether in the cranium of Sir John Simon.

Even with Sir John at the British Foreign Office, and with the United States outside the League, something came close to happening. If the United States had been in the League, on the terms of the Lodge reservations, the League itself would have been a different instrument, the scepticism would have been less, probably another than the ambiguous Sir John Simon would have conducted British policy, and then the Japanese reckoning about the League as a world force would have been different. As we look over the past, in which we ourselves have helped build the present and the future, we are too inclined to take things for granted. What came, we say, cannot be undone, which is true enough. But we also assume that what came was inevitable, which is false. Here, at the first test of the world's choice of a new order in which aggression no longer would be unopposed, we see human desires rise almost to the acting point. Despite the victory of a small minority which kept the United States out of the League, despite the growing cynicism of elderly men in Europe, despite the network of frustration which had been woven against it, collective security came close to functioning.

From then on the story of collective security is tragic. For nothing fails like failure. And Japan taught the world the lesson that the nineteenth century has beaten the twentieth, and we still live under conditions in which nations are unwilling to pay the price of mutual helpfulness. The next test of collective security was over Ethiopia. Japan might have been stopped by an earnest gesture. But once Japan had demonstrated the safety of aggression earnest gestures were no longer enough. When Italy set out to conquer an empire the problems of collective security at once became more complex and expensive. To begin with, Europe was confronted by a rebellious Fascist State, and that fact added a new dimension to the troubles. For Fascism rests on the military power, it is the nation at arms, in which personal discipline is enforced by the military ideal. Fascism is dedicated to the proposition that individual conflicts within the State are to be perpetually forbidden but that international

conflicts are to recur everlastingly. And how is one to erect a system of society which outlaws war and conciliates rivalries if some of its most formidable members disagree with its first principles? Even so the test had to be met. If Mussolini could annex a member of the League that would destroy the League. And this time the issue was quite clear to the British. To the men of Whitehall it was clear because Italy's ambitions endangered the British Empire. But that is not what awoke the British public. It had been aroused by the folly of British policy at Geneva, and the Peace Ballot had registered an overwhelming belief, not in the sanctity of Empire communications, but in the ideal of collective security. The Peace Ballot had rebuked the Tory-mindedness of the British Government, an occasion when human desires rose to the surface and expressed themselves over the heads of government. But it was too late, as we now know. Action taken in time might have stopped Mussolini before he began. If the British Foreign Office had appreciated the feelings of the British public, Mussolini would have been told that if he tried to conquer Ethiopia he would have had the British against him and probably the whole League, and he would not have dared what he did. But the hour of warning was let pass. And over in Paris was that calamity of this epoch, Laval—he and Sir John Simon will loom large in the history of the Twentieth Century—and Laval was not warning Mussolini, he was giving him advice as to the best way to conquer his empire and get away with it. And under Laval, the French threw away the ideal of collective security, and chose instead to base their power on bargains made in secret. Even so the small States of Europe under British leadership did move the League to apply sanctions against Italy. Mussolini was trapped. But he saved himself by the only strategy left. He threatened to fight. France, he knew, would not want a war. And the British Tories wanted it even less.

The threat of war by Mussolini over the application of oil sanctions raised a problem which has become the corner-stone of European relations. What shall be done with a nation which threatens to use violence to gain its national ends? Shall it be fought? The French looked at that answer and rejected it during the Ethiopian crisis. The French people had no stomach for a war over a primitive African back-country. The thought that such a conflict should bring Italian aeroplanes over Paris was repugnant to them. The British also shied away. But they shied away for different reasons. There were the obvious reasons that war would be costly and disruptive, and the brunt of it would fall on them. It would set back British economy for a decade. But there was one reason more, which I am sure weighed heavily in the motives of responsible British leaders. They were afraid, if you please, of the

consequences of defeating Mussolini. They knew they could beat him. But were they sure they wanted to beat him? Supposing he fell, and the Fascist *régime* crumbled, and Italy was beset by a period of revolution? Right away you see the peace factor which I mentioned a while back, the security of governments themselves, without which peace is impossible. To the British ruling class the choice was between grave trouble in Europe and minor trouble in Africa. If revolution burned in Italy the fire was sure to spread to France. If it burned in France it might spread to other continental countries and leap the Channel to England. And then what security would there be for the British ruling class? In a sense the preservation of Italian Fascism became a line of defence for the preservation of the internal balance of power within Great Britain. It was vital that there should be no revolution in Italy. It was still more vital there should be none in France. And the crafty Mussolini, his back to the wall, his conquest already undertaken, dared the governments of Europe to destroy him. They could do it. He knew they could. But he cried boldly, "Give me my conquest, for if you don't you will lose your own safety!"

He *was* given his conquest. And with that gift ended the possibility of collective security for many years. It was blown out like a candle. Europe had found its answer to the problem of aggression. It would yield to it. Granted the aggressor pursued his national aims in out-of-the-way places, where the immediate and vital interests of the other Powers were not involved, or that he asked only concessions which did not directly humiliate the other Powers, he should have what he wanted.

Hitler, watching the Italian drama with rising enthusiasm, knew that his hour had struck. He already had started tearing up the Treaty of Versailles, paragraph by paragraph. He was building his army and air force. He now saw that he could realize the dreams of power which the Kaiser had dreamed. For the world had been made safe for aggression if properly undertaken. The Kaiser had been harnessed by the Balance of Power. Now there was no Balance. There were only governments who were afraid for their own internal security, and people who were frightened out of their skins by the new horrors of modern war. Hitler would occupy the Rhineland and fortify it, and in a stroke he would topple France from her high place as the master of continental Europe. If France could not invade Germany the French alliances in Eastern Europe were worthless. And Germany could resume her historic expansion in Middle Europe. So Hitler marched into the Rhineland and France and Britain did not lift a finger. He withdrew from the Treaty of Locarno. Then he and Mussolini together entered the war in Spain. They did it with the steady application of the now permanent threat,

"Leave us to have our way or we'll fight". And the democracies, inventing the most sinister hypocrisy of our times, non-intervention, let them have their way.

It was during this terrible war that Chamberlain let Eden resign from the Cabinet, and served notice that the League no longer could be the fulcrum of British policy. In so doing he signed and sealed the burial certificate of collective security. But it was not the death warrant, and there is an element of unfairness in the bitter reproaches which have showered on him in this country. One can berate Chamberlain for being no idealist, which he is not, for not keeping up a fight in the lost cause, which he declines to do. But one cannot accuse him of having murdered the League and collective security. The corpse was in the mortuary when he came into office. What he did was to propose to bury the corpse and get on with the world as he found it. He did it without a funeral. He did it without tears. He did it almost happily, as though the dead thing had never been alive and had meant much to civilization. But he was right, collective security *was* dead. And he was not unreasonable, if he wanted to get along in the real world which confronted him. The world was not ready to fight dictators. He himself was not ready to fight them. So since he had to live with them, he would do so on the best terms he could get. He made his bargain with Italy. It was a good bargain for a British politician. That is, he took everything and granted nothing, beyond recognizing Italy's status as a Mediterranean Power. It was an unfortunate bargain for ethical reasons, but they were indirect reasons. The bargain was based on Italy getting out of Spain without loss of prestige, which means a Franco victory, and a new triumph for foreign aggression. But the British people had already consented in principle to a Franco victory. This was a minor element for such as Chamberlain. He is no man to perform ethical feats for the edification of metaphysicians and history. He is a realist. He is trying to get on in the world as it is. He is trying to stave off a really great war. In time he hopes to get Germany into a similar bargain. Then the four powers, Britain, France, Italy and Germany will rule Europe, they will restore the nineteenth century system of the Balance of Power. That is how Mr. Chamberlain thinks. How wise he is, I shall ask you to consider in a moment. I am not giving him any accolade. I am only saying that he doesn't deserve the reproaches he has been getting from America.

Now to come to the latest phase of the new system of safe aggression, Austria and Czecho-slovakia. Its principles by now have become pretty well defined. The system already has a technique. If an aggressor nation wants something, he must, first of all, be ready to fight for it. Never mind if he is sure to lose the war if he

fights. He has to be ready to fight. Other countries, as we already have seen, are not very keen on winning wars. Secondly, he must pick the right place for aggression. Commit the aggression somewhere where vital British, French, and Russian interests are not at stake. Thirdly, if a racial principle is involved, get what you want without using actual violence, and try that first of all. This applied to Austria, which Hitler wanted, as he wants all racial Germans incorporated in the Third Reich. Austria was protected by treaties. But there are ways to circumvent treaties. Bore from within, the old Communist tactic. Organize your Nazi movement in Austria. When the time for the squeeze play comes, force the government to take Nazis into the Cabinet in key positions. Once you have the courts and the police, you can crush any opposition, and then the independent Austrian Government is in reality a Nazi Government. It will take orders from Berlin. That can go on for a time, but one day the independent Austrian Government simply joins Germany, and who is to lift a finger? That is what Hitler had in mind in Austria. This was the patient way, the way that the aggressor has been taught to take—if he has to. As it turned out, Hitler took the short cut in Austria. Schuschnigg, when he proposed to hold a plebiscite on genuine Austrian independence, crossed Hitler, which to Hitler was like defying a deity. When Schuschnigg held his fateful interview with Hitler at Berchtesgaden the Führer thundered at him: "Apparently you do not realize that before you stands the greatest German of centuries!" And with godly wrath Hitler marched his army into Austria and annexed it then and there. The impatient way succeeded, for Mussolini was the only one who really cared about what happened to Austria, and at the time he was in effect locked up in a private room negotiating with Chamberlain.

Czecho-slovakia came next, and here Hitler prepared to apply the patient system, backed up as usual with the threat of fighting. The German minority in Czecho-slovakia was Nazified. Henlein, its leader, began taking his orders from Berlin. And Hitler has had two simultaneous theatres to stock with drama. Through Henlein he played on the racial bitterness that could be engendered in the Sudeten regions. In the foreign chancelleries of Europe he could enlist support for the next move in Czecho-slovakia, that of obtaining autonomy for the German minority. Autonomy, of course, would mean that the German districts would be governed by Nazis, and the Nazis in turn would be governed by Berlin. There apparently was a departure from the patient programme a few weeks ago, and German troops began gathering on the Czech border. But the Czechs mobilized and the German troops were withdrawn. But Europe was thus given its war scare. And in consequence, London and Paris bore down on Prague to insist on the grant of autonomy

to the Nazified minority. So the new system of aggression was blessed and aided by the democracies.

What comes next? Who knows? Danzig, the Polish corridor, Memel—these are as certain to fall to Germany as anything is calculably certain. Then there are racial Germans in other countries, Switzerland, Alsace-Lorraine, the Baltic States. Here is the way to stir up continuous agitation and brawling among them, and absorb them all in time. Germany's prestige, naturally, is rising in Eastern Europe. Hungary and Roumania need not be actually conquered. They can be brought into the German orbit. Once they are there, Germany has the wheat of the Hungarian plains and oil from the Roumanian oilfields, and can hold out in a long war. So as Germany grows stronger, the German war threat becomes more formidable. Each time it is made it will be more effective. And the end is not in sight.

Now out of such a State as Germany, which now promises to become the great power of the continent, and out of Italy, which also must expand if it is to have internal peace, Chamberlain expects to build a system of peace by associating them with a re-armed Britain and a still militarized France. That expectation represents the maximum of wisdom of to-day's statesmanship in Europe. The peace is to be kept by a Four-Power Pact. The four will agree not to go to war with each other. For that, obviously, must be the first consideration. But two of the four Powers are Fascist, or expanding States, and the other two are democratic or static States. So the system will be one in which the expansion of the Fascists is regulated, one almost might say supervised, by the democracies. It is a disagreeable picture. It was disagreeable when Mussolini was allowed to have his Ethiopia. It was disagreeable when Hitler could annex his Austria. It became even more disagreeable when the democracies brought pressure on Czecho-slovakia to surrender to virtual dismemberment in Germany's interest. It is disagreeable to see the democracies purchasing their own safety at the cost of Loyalist Spain. Compared with this system the League of Nations even at its worst was a temple of virtue. And its only claim to consideration is that it will work, that it will avert a general European War. To succeed the democracies will have to condone the perpetual expansion of the Fascist States, which means they will see to it that others than themselves pay the piper. The small States of Europe must be sacrificed, perhaps in the end Russia, for the destiny of Germany, as Hitler sees it, is to rule over the Ukraine. But there is no guarantee that it will succeed. Germany and Italy to-day are far weaker than Britain and France, and they will be content to take the patient way for as long as they are weaker. But they will not always be weaker. Each year sees Germany stronger, with more men

trained to fight and more aeroplanes to darken the sky. Each year, too, sees Germany extend her influence so as to have access to the raw materials she needs to hold out in a great war. To expect that Hitler will forever take second place to Great Britain is to expect the incredible. If, one day, he sees that he can have the British Empire by fighting for it, he will fight. So the Four-Power Pact is a stop-gap. It does not build on any constructive principle, it is the price paid for a breathing spell. And even Chamberlain, I am sure, would not claim more for it. If he were here to-night I think he could say, "Well, what would you have? A war with Germany right away? Certainly not, neither would I. Then what else can I do?"

I have painted this picture of the world to-day, a regressive world, brutal, half-frightened, preliminary to discussing what our own policy ought to be. You will have gathered, I am sure, that I am convinced that there is no possibility to establish a system of collective security in this world to-day. Collective security is dead. The corpse has been buried. If it is to live it must be born again. But I trust you have also gathered that I yearn that it should be born again, and that I regard it as the only possible alternative to the present terrible state of international relations.

Now we hear a great deal about keeping the United States out of war. That agitation has its source in two strangely different and strangely allied forces in this country. It rises from the isolationists and it rises from the pacifists. About two years ago the pacifists and the isolationists struck up a partnership to keep us out of war. Their objective is one with which nobody can quarrel. But it needs to be remembered that the isolationists aren't pacifists and the pacifists aren't isolationists. The isolationists are people who believe in making yourself so strong that nobody will dare attack you, and then staying out of other countries' quarrels. What they are against is not war as such, but war for the sake of some foreign country, or war for the sake of some principle affecting a foreign country. They distrust all foreigners. If necessary they would stop all trade with foreign lands, and prevent all economic co-operation which would tend to draw us into associations which might pull us into war. The isolationists are convinced that we are not of the world, and that we need not be of it. They believe that injustice done to some foreign country is no concern of ours. Our only concern is to be so strong that nobody will dare to do injustice to us. The dogma of the isolationist breathes no brotherhood and sympathy for the fellow-human being who happens not to be an American. It does not look forward to a gradual extension of the brotherhood of man until all shall be at peace together. It is a narrow, strictly non-ethical, morbidly suspicious, and fundamentally militarist philosophy.

The pacifist, on the other hand, also doesn't want war, but not because he thinks foreigners are inferior to him, and that they are trying to "gyp" him, but because he is against the slaughter of human lives under the sanction of patriotism. He likes human beings, he doesn't want to kill them. He thinks human conflicts ought to be resolved in some other way. He doesn't believe patriotic slogans and he thinks that most wars are fought out of greed—not the foreigner's greed, but home greed—that greed disguised to arouse the love of country. A few American pacifists have accepted the teaching of Christ to the point of being against all war, and so are genuine non-resisters. I must say I am perplexed that the number of these completely consistent pacifists should be so small in this country. Most pacifists are not non-resisters when it comes to the test. But they favour disarmament, and they genuinely long for the day when war will be outlawed and kept outlawed. But they would not approve of the United States going to war to save China, let us say, or would not have welcomed collective action against Japan through the League or the nine Powers of the Nine-Power Treaty, if it might have drawn us into war, even a naval war relatively of small dimensions, which would defeat Japan chiefly through economic pressure.

If a pacifist to-day tells me America must stay out of war in the world of to-day I agree with him and I sympathize with him. But if an isolationist tells me the same thing I agree with him—and I don't sympathize with him. For it is the isolationist, the hater of foreigners, the suspicious provincial, the man who doesn't care what happens to anybody else, who has helped create the world as it is to-day. If it had not been for the isolationist we should have been free to-day to work out the principles of collective security which we cannot work out. We could have gone into the League and helped change it into an instrument of justice. I am not saying it would have become a perfect instrument or the world a perfect world. But it would have been far better than the world of to-day. And when I hear an isolationist speaker condemn this world, and give its awful predicament as a reason for our staying aloof from it, I wonder why his audience doesn't rise up and shout back at him, "But this is the world you must have wanted, for you wouldn't bear your share to make it better". The slick, intellectual effrontery of the isolationist who helped make the world of to-day and then holds it up as the kind of world we must shun, is one of the signs of the dishonest thinking of this day and age. You can't withhold your contribution to international justice and the establishment of peace, and keep the right to criticize the failure of that justice and that peace.

As long as a nation believes that *nothing* is worth a war, it can remain out of any and all wars. But that is not the belief in this

country. We are not a nation of non-resisters. If we were, I repeat, that would be a wholly consistent and indeed a spiritually substantial philosophy. But not even many of our pacifists take this position, and our isolationists certainly do not. So the campaign to keep America out of war means merely to keep us out of the international mess of to-day. And it does not mean that we should keep out of war if our immediate and vital interests were affected. Our isolationists would then want to fight, for it is their doctrine to fight under such circumstances. And our pacifists with quite different views about national interests would then find the alliance with the isolationists a most embarrassing marriage indeed, one which they would have to end with a scandalous divorce. What they have gained in their present alliance is hard to see. What they might lose from it is far too easy to see. But for the moment their romance is happy, and for the moment this country is determined to stay out of a war, since no war on the immediate horizon would serve any truly American interests whatever. We could not now, for instance, fight a war which would clearly preserve international justice and establish collective security. Such a war would have to be fought collectively, and all nations who believe in justice would need to make their contribution, and the love of justice would have to be their real motive. Such a war is out of the question for the present. And our national interests in China, though they are large, have not been jeopardized yet to the point where a war on their account comes under consideration.

But it must be clear that in the world of to-day a national cry to stay out of war, since it is not a genuinely pacifist cry, means little. It is no guarantee against war. Our position is not that we will never go to war. It is that we won't go to war unless some foreign country drives us into a war. That is, we have given the responsibility for the peace of the United States to others. We do not live in a world where everyone is responsible for the peace. In it are powerful nations who believe in war and will fight anyone who crosses their path. If they want what we have, and they are strong enough, they will fight us. And we shall fight back. That may sound far-fetched since we are so strong and we are protected by two oceans. Perhaps it is far-fetched. But our national interests extend to Latin America, and we may not be as invulnerable as we presume. Suppose that in the next ten years war broke out between Germany and Great Britain. Suppose Great Britain should lose that war and the British Empire should fall to Nazi Germany. Then we should have a very acute sense of danger. The British Empire is not very popular in this country just now, but it would become popular if it were threatened by a Nazi conquest. I can quite well conceive it possible that the United States would prefer war to the disappearance of the British

Empire, not for reasons of abstract justice or collective security, but for the elemental safety of everything America stands for, in other words, for purely national American reasons.

The point I wish to make is that the isolationist attitude is no safeguard against war. It only defines the kind of war the isolationist is ready to fight. Isolationism is no system of peace. It does nothing to make a peaceful world. It has no principles and no faith. In it breathes none of the humanism which is the oxygen of a civilization. It is a barren, negative, and selfish thing. And since it refuses to accept world responsibility it stands athwart the hope of establishing a world of peace. It resigns itself to the inevitability of war as a human institution. And those who resign themselves to that inevitability have helped create that inevitability.

Let me come back for a moment to Mr. Chamberlain and the policy of peaceful surrender to aggression. I believe Mr. Chamberlain has one chance to avert a general European war through his particular brand of isolationism. That chance is that there is such a thing as satiety for Fascism. There is a school of opinion in England which reasons this way: the Nazi movement was created by the injustices done to Germany in the Treaty of Versailles and the treatment accorded to Germany after the war. Germany has become pathological because of humiliation and poverty. Cure the humiliation and wipe out the poverty, Germany will become sane again. The modern way to cure mental disorders is not with violence but with understanding. Remove the causes of disorder and sanity will be redeemed.

The right or wrong of this thesis may be the most important question in the world to-day. If it is right, Europe could swing into a new era of peace in which collective security might be re-born, armaments reduced, and co-operation resumed. If it is wrong Europe will be rent by a war that will shake every corner of the world, and may draw us in.

But I am sceptical about the outcome of this test. The doctrine sounds to me like engaging modernist patter. The time to have cured Germany was when it was a Republic, when Germany wanted to be cured. But the madness of Nazi-ism, though it seems madness to you and me, to the Nazis is a religion. With it they hope to conquer and save the world. So far it has been the only successful doctrine of the last decade. It has won essentially everything that it has wanted, while the democracies have won nothing and lost much. Now as this religion goes on succeeding (as it will under the Chamberlain policy) we are asked to hope that its sheer success will turn good Nazis against it. They will be so triumphant that they cannot stomach any more triumphs.

It sounds fantastic, and I think it is fantastic. Fascism is a military State which must expand to survive. In it the individual is penalized for the good of the State, and he will not tolerate regimentation unless he sees results for his pains. There must be always new results, or he will rebel. The time goes on and the results will always be harder to get and will always cost more. And in this way satiation might be reached. But that would spell revolution. And no dictator will tolerate revolution if he can hold his power with a last supreme war effort. So I just don't believe in this doctrine. I think there is little chance of success for Mr. Chamberlain, beyond the success of delay. He has postponed general war. He is giving the Fascists a period of peaceful expansion, and they will become so strong that they can thank him for it by assaulting the British Empire.

It is a bleak picture, and I hope I have not been unduly pessimistic in my presentation of it. The world has become what it is despite a wealth of good intentions that it should be something vastly better. The American people were deprived of their opportunity to play their part in this world by seven men. For if seven senators had changed their votes the United States would have come into the League with reservations, and those reservations would not have weakened the League a tenth as much as our absence from it. The possibility of stopping aggression by a show of force, rather than its use (which is the way aggression is met in our domestic society), was lost in the Manchurian crisis. Then the British public, in its turn, was thwarted and frustrated by the handful of men who made British policy. And finally the system of collective security broke down as the cost of it mounted high in the Ethiopian war. And now we are living in a world where the only system of peace is to yield to the aggressor and try to guide him to commit his aggressions against the weak, and to do it without a general war. And this system leads directly to the growth of force at the disposal of the Fascist States to the point that their attack on the European democracies seems only a question of years, and not many years at that.

In this world America can play very little useful part at present. It cannot restrain the aggressors, for there is no collective system with which it now can co-operate. If it joins the power system of Europe on the side of the democracies, it might conceivably postpone somewhat longer the inevitable conflict. But it would have done nothing to create a world of peace. It would only have become a partisan in the ultimate showdown.

Then what is left? Is there no policy upon which men of good will can unite? These are dark hours. In two years, as I said at the outset, two million lives have been lost in two wars. And there is no path that seems to lead through the difficulties that confront the

entire world. But beyond these difficulties *you* know, and I know, that certain truths must prevail if civilization is to be restored. And we also believe that whatever happens civilization will be restored. Our generation has tried half-hearted collective security and it failed. We now have regulated aggression and it is succeeding. In the last analysis there are the two alternatives, a world of aggression or a world of justice, a world in which the weak are thrown to the lions, or a world in which the safety of one is recognized as part of the safety of all, a world denying the brotherhood of man, or a world affirming it and bearing responsibility for its realization.

America, it seems to me, has in the years to come a great opportunity. We have, in the first place, the privilege of sanity. For here we are, farther removed from fear and horror than any other great nation. We have the privilege of our heritage; this has been a continent born in freedom and dedicated to freedom, a continent which has bloomed with idealism, and laboured with courageous optimism. As a people we are a replica of the world itself in the make-up of our population, and in the main we have learned to live kindly with one another, and to demonstrate that a conglomerate population can be welded into a fairly tolerant whole. Out of this America rose the first dream of collective security, of a world society which should not leave the destiny of men to the whims of a Kaiser or a Czar. Out of this same America can rise a new and a maturer conception of a collective security which will save mankind from the whims of a Hitler and a Mussolini. We can approach the re-birth of collective security with humility since we ourselves have contributed to its first failure.

For my part I hope America will be able to stay out of the power rivalries of Europe. And if we do even for a time, we may be able to come to a war-darkened Europe with the torch of peace, the only civilized peace there is, peace based on brotherhood and the rejection of the creed of brute force.

This is a task to which we must be dedicated now if we are to perform it with unity and conviction when the time comes. And neither the isolationists nor the pacifists are preparing us for it. They are content to-day to be negative, to say only "don't" to our becoming involved in a war to-day. That negative is good as far as any negative can be good. But it is not enough, it does not add to our understanding of the forces at work in the world, it does not educate us to make our contribution to a genuine system of peace, it does not make us conscious of our brotherhood with all mankind.

It is a fact collective security is dead. But it is a truth that collective security must live again. That is a positive resolve. It is one for a wiser and a sadder world to realize.

VOCATION AS THE CLUE TO ECCLESIASTICAL DIVERSITY

By Prof. W. R. Forrester, B.D.

One of the signs of the times is the revival of apocalypticism. There is everywhere a strong reaction from what one might call evolutionism in religious thinking, with its tendency to a comprehensive and tolerant and flabby humanism. The spiritual climate of Europe has changed in a most marked way in the last few years. We are now living in the age of the shirts, black, brown, red, grey—this is a very shirty age, and to meet it the Church must put on the hair shirt of penitence and self-discipline. Persecution has revived. In Russia and Germany organized religion is fighting with its back to the wall. Niemöller is in a concentration camp with many others for conscience' sake. In Manchuria and Spain the Churches are making heavy weather. In Italy Mussolini and the Pope have apparently come to terms; the lion and the lamb lie down together, with the lamb inside. All the Protestant bodies in Italy are passing through a very difficult time, as Mussolini attempts to make use of religion to further his imperialism. In Germany Hitler's annoyance with both Roman Catholics and Protestants is due to his inability to get them to unite to further his plans of national unity in a kind of religion which will consecrate the demonic claims of the Nazi state.

The situation confronting Christianity is more threatening than anything in history since the early days of Islam. Is Christianity or a merciless Marxism or a blatant and unscrupulous Fascism going to win the East? Are Russia and Germany and Spain going to become lost provinces of Christianity as were the countries of North Africa when they were overwhelmed by Islam? If Mussolini continues to dominate the Pope, how long will Roman Catholicism be able to avoid another Great Schism? Few things are more certain than that large bodies of Roman Catholics in America, Britain, and elsewhere in Europe will break away from Rome, unless the Pope ceases to be the puppet of the new pseudo-Roman imperialism in Italy. Austria, yesterday a bulwark of Romanism, is no more.

Everywhere the old order is changing. In politics liberalism is in full retreat, with its ideals of freedom and orderly progress. In economics every canon of sound finance and unwritten law of business is flagrantly broken every day, apparently with complete impunity, by governments and syndicates; and what would be punished as robbery if practised on a small scale by an individual is applauded as wise policy in a ruler or a government. Ever since Marx we have been forced, however unwillingly, to admit the close correspondence that exists between our ecclesiastical, our political,

and our economic, institutions. With the collapse of liberal ideas in politics, of the doctrine of *laissez-faire* in economics, and the emergence of a planned economy everywhere, we must be prepared for profound changes in our ecclesiastical institutions, if they are not merely to survive, but to influence the world of our day creatively and redemptively.

For instance, the heyday of liberalism in Great Britain corresponded with the great period of Free Trade and *laissez-faire*. Along with these went the policy of Voluntaryism so prominent especially in Nonconformist Churches, and the Disestablishment movement, which has had strong supporters even within the Church of England since the rejection of the Deposited Prayerbook. These three, political liberalism, economic *laissez-faire,* and ecclesiastical voluntaryism, were closely allied to one another; in fact they were simply different versions of the one attitude to public life. Now the whole climate has changed. It is not so much that our questions have been answered and our problems solved, but we no longer ask the same questions and we are confronting new and more dangerous problems. We are face to face with the Corporative State, already in being in Russia, Germany, Turkey, and more or less in Japan. Even in the countries which have not as yet adopted this type of organization it is recognized that the old era of haphazard opportunism in politics and economics is at an end, and they are hastily attempting to set their house in order by formulating plans of political control, where formerly everything was left to the unregulated operation of the supposed laws of supply and demand. Control is the order of the day, and inevitably so if we are to be saved from chaos, with violent fluctuations of markets and prices, appalling unemployment, and the inevitable nemesis of war. But man is more than plan.

The Corporative State, erected on a purely secular basis, working for purely secular ends by methods which know no law except their effectiveness, is rapidly coming to be recognized for what it is, *the negation of God erected into a system.* It is true that there is much in our capitalistic system which negates God at least as seriously. And it is no less true that the Roman Catholic Church is adapting itself to the corporative system as one within which it can work successfully, far more so than within the capitalist system where it has never been quite at home. But to us Protestants the aims and methods of the Corporative State are anathema, because they deny the freedom of the individual conscience and the rights of the individual soul. It is quite true that a free Church can only exist and function properly within a free State. It is no less true, though not so often recognized, that a free State is impossible without the spiritual support and nourishment of a free Church. *The countries which have most successfully achieved political freedom have been the countries where there has been greatest ecclesiastical diversity.* Figgis goes

so far as to say that political liberty is the residuary legatee of ecclesiastical animosities. If for animosities he would write diversities we could not quarrel with him. In all our thought about Christian unity we must remember how much our social heritage has been enriched by our diversities. In Scotland one of the things prominently before us in framing the recent union of the Churches was the undoubted fact that in the past spiritual revival has almost always issued in secession or disruption. The Church of Rome in this has usually shown great ecclesiastical wisdom, though not always. It recognizes this universal spiritual tendency. Every breath of the Spirit seeks to clothe itself in an appropriate body, and Rome has learnt to provide for these new movements and to profit by them. It creates a new Order *within* the Church, with its own leaders, its spiritual Rule, and special functions. So the Church is enriched by these new movements, and they are enabled to bear testimony to the new light without being forced to seek relief of conscience in secession. Outsiders are seldom aware of the extraordinary complexity and even divergence of tendency within the Roman Church.

The Church of England also has learned this lesson of history. It now contains elements so heterogeneous that others wonder how it can maintain even the semblance of unity, still less the reality of spiritual fellowship, and the most rudimentary ecclesiastical discipline. But if the Anglican Church had always been as Catholic and comprehensive, it might quite easily have brought or kept within its borders George Fox, the Wesleys, and William Booth, to say nothing of others.

In Scotland, with the vast majority of the population now within one Church, we are facing the same problem and learning the same lesson, and hoping and preparing, so that when the breath of the Spirit does come in revival, it will not mean, as it has almost always meant in the past, a secession or a disruption, because the old ecclesiastical bottles cannot contain the new wine. We have now within the united Church of Scotland our extreme High Church party, our hot Evangelicals, our Modernists, our Fundamentalists, our Voluntaries and our Establishment men, our Pacifists and our Sanctionists, our Barthians and our Humanists, all within one Communion. We recognize that as there is a better thing than Romanism, so there is a better thing than sectarianism. We must abandon the old reproach of our unhappy divisions, and begin to acknowledge how much we owe to the rich diversity of our denominational contributions to the one Body of Christ.

It is no accident that the Church, in response to the reaction towards authoritarianism in politics, is taking refuge in apocalypticism. This is true to type, and in accordance with the genius of our faith. In times of persecution the Church abandons the outworks of human-

ism, where it has given hostages to the world and is insecure because of treachery within the walls, and takes refuge within the impregnable keep of apocalypticism. Karl Barth is a pure apocalyptic prophet: there is to be no compromise with the world, no contact with it—humanism, liberalism, culture, and civilization, these are all classed with secular things; and to them all the Church, built on the Word of God, responds with a challenge and a stark negation. In ethics as well as in theology the new note is becoming more distinctive. Reinhold Niebuhr, for instance, is a pure apocalyptic. It is a sign of the times. When persecution breaks out the Church entrenches itself in apocalyptic, as for instance in the *Book of Revelation,* and waits like Wellington within the lines of Torres Vedras for the assaults of the enemy to exhaust themselves, before sallying forth again in missionary endeavour and programmes of social reform to convert souls and bring in the Kingdom of God.

Now this most interesting movement away from liberalism and towards apocalypticism has important and immediate ecclesiastical repercussions. In some cases movements towards incorporating union that looked most promising a few years ago are now making little or no progress. Apocalyptic religion has its merits, but tolerance is not one of them, just as ascetic and evangelical religion is always apt to be intolerant and fanatical. That, of course, points to the necessity of cross-fertilizing each type of religious experience with the others in the fellowship of the Church. The Catholic needs to live in constant contact with the Sectary and the Mystic, if he is to be saved from formalism and barren ecclesiasticism. The Mystic becomes self-centred and apathetic, unless he is continually aroused by the Evangelist. The Evangelist is in grave moral danger, unless he is in a pastoral fellowship with the Christian community as well as in redeeming contact with individuals. And so on. That is one of the things that make an ordinary congregation of the Church of Christ so enormously interesting from the psychological point of view. It should be as far as possible a fellowship of all the varieties of religious experience. And the extent to which it can contain and benefit from their diversity is a proof of its possession of the Spirit of God, and of its successful proclamation of the Gospel of the grace and kingdom of God. The same is or ought to be true of our denominations, so far as these are justifiable as furthering the Kingdom, each contributing its distinctive testimony.

There are some who look upon our denominational system as an unmitigated misfortune, an expression of the sin of schism which does anything but commend the Gospel and promote the Kingdom of God. Without attempting to defend all aspects and aberrations of denominationalism, we should entertain the possibility that such a system in some form may be part of the purpose of God for the Church, and may become the best means of promoting the Kingdom.

In hearing and reading some dissertations on Church unity (which is frequently confused with Church union, a very different thing), one is sometimes tempted to believe that it is an offence against public decency for a man to have two ears, two eyes, two hands, two feet, ten fingers, and ten toes!

It is a matter for congratulation that we have at last escaped from the endless relativity of humanistic ethics. But we have not yet, either in theology or in ethics, come to terms with the category of evolution, which is the dominant conception still in the biological world, and which looked at the first blush as if it were going to explain or explain away all our moral distinctions and values. There is no doubt that the scientific procedure of describing everything in terms of the lowest category available has resulted in a general tendency to reduce all the values of our human life to their lowest terms. The worst instance of this is probably behaviourism in psychology. The result has been a widespread belief that there are no absolutes; beauty, truth, and goodness, are all merely relative terms, and man is the measure of all things. Pascal's reed which thinks has become the rod to determine all values, and unfortunately it has proved little better than a broken reed. That explains the disillusionment and pessimism of the humanists. A witty observer has described the prevailing temper of our day as one of "Stoicism in plus fours". Hence has come the flight from humanism, the "return to religion", which in too many cases means only an attempt to enlist religion on behalf of a fainting humanist cause, or taking refuge in what T. S. Eliot calls a "Catholicism of despair". Men thrust forward their hands towards anyone who seems to possess authority, and beseech him to put handcuffs on them to keep them from trembling. The return to authority in religion is partly a symptom of the similar trend in politics, economics, and culture generally, and partly a reaction from it in the case of those who are terrified by the new Moloch. The Corporative State is at once the apotheosis and the nemesis of tendencies which have been growing upon European civilization since the Renaissance. The humanists, gazing in terror upon this awful apparition which claims to be their child, but in which they see only a reversion to barbarism, throw themselves under the protection of whatsoever gods there be.

In reaction from the evolutionary views to which everything was only a little more or less, a little better or worse, and denominational differences were at best a necessary evil, which became less and less of an evil as they became less necessary, it looks as if we were approaching a period of intolerant and fanatical dogmatism in religion, in which it is going to be very difficult to conserve the real humanist values in our faith, and to temper conviction with charity. It is significant to observe how the new movements of our time,

such as Barthianism and the Groups, are becoming intensely fanatical and pharisaic.

We cannot deny that there is an element of relativity in all our human values, intellectual, ethical, and ecclesiastical, to mention no others. My view of truth is a pathetic shadow of the absolute truth; my deepest convictions about right and wrong are qualified and even determined by the limitations of our situation and its outlook. My conscience does not reveal to me absolute truth, absolute goodness, or even absolute duty; it tells me this is right and that is wrong, for me now in my present situation. In framing general rules of conduct we must take into account that we all have our moral perspectives, as we have our visual perspectives in observing objects in space, with all the qualifications and limitations that such perspectives imply. *My duty* is largely determined for me by my station; it may be imperative and absolute in that sense, without being universally obligatory upon everyone in all circumstances.

It is the recognition of this real and inevitable relativity of our moral perspectives that leads many to scepticism, in despair of reaching any absolute values, and leads many more to trifle with such real and all-important distinctions as right and wrong, good and evil. Hence arises the moral indifferentism so common to-day. "It all comes to the same thing in the end". "Evil is good a little less fully developed". Philosophical or secular ethics is unable to extricate itself from the toils of evolutionism and arrive at any absolute values. Even personality itself on humanistic terms is not an absolute value: it only becomes so with the advent of the Christian doctrine of the immortality of the soul, which thus, strangely enough, becomes a political principle of the utmost value, and the only conclusive argument against the liquidation policy pursued against inconvenient individuals by the Corporative State.

It is here that the principle of Vocation becomes so important for our times. The word Vocation occurs only once in the Authorised Version, and even there the Revised Version gets rid of it, but the principle is fundamental throughout the whole of Scripture. The Old Testament is the Book of the Vocation of Israel. The Covenant idea is itself a doctrine of Vocation, and Vocation is the secret of the authority of the prophets, and also of the kings and priests of Israel. In the New Testament the very name *Ecclesia* means the society of the Called of God. Paul addresses the Churches at Rome, Corinth, and elsewhere as "called to be saints" and claims his authority as an Apostle because he has been called by God to that office. And in *1 Cor.* 7 we have the germs of that doctrine of the "earthly" or "secular" calling that has proved so fruitful especially in Protestantism in preventing the distinction between sacred and secular from becoming such a stumbling-block as it has proved to be

in the Roman doctrine of the priesthood and what they call "the religious vocation".

But that vastly interesting subject we must leave on one side with this remark: *to us Christians our duty is relative, but not endlessly relative, it is relative to our Vocation.* Vocation is at once a principle of individuation and of integration, a justification of diversity and a means of promoting unity. Whereas the moral philosopher can only speak of "my station and its duties", as things arbitrarily determined for him, the Christian has in his hands a principle which serves to explain how duty can be absolute without being universal, how I may be sure this line of conduct is right for me, without necessarily proceeding at once to impose it without modification upon my neighbours as absolute and universally binding on them too. In short, this principle enables us to achieve one of the rarest things in the spiritual life—*a union of deep and passionate conviction with broad and tolerant and sympathetic charity for other peoples' convictions, opinions, and loyalties. What is the Vocation of some need not necessarily be the duty of all.*

For us Christians both faith and conscience are but different aspects of one attitude to God and man. A variation in our conception of duty will invariably be accompanied by a corresponding variation in our beliefs. It is impossible to attain, and unwise to attempt to secure, absolute uniformity of belief unless and until there is identity of duty. That is to say, there will be variations of belief as and because there are perspectives of duty, and both relative to our Vocation. So we arrive at *the root and the rationale of our religious diversities. They are not necessarily due to the moral perversity of the people who differ from us, but may indicate the part they are each expected to play in life to the glory of God.*

If we turn to *Eph.* 4, we find, as one might expect, that this mention of Vocation is closely linked to the distinctively Pauline teaching on the Body of Christ. *Eph.* $4^{1\text{-}13}$ is quite conclusive on this important conjunction. It applies directly to the relations of individuals to one another and to the Church. The Church is meant to be a "cosmos of callings", where each of us finds the place God means us to fill and serve Him faithfully in it, remembering he is only a member of the One Body. It is important to observe how this Christian doctrine of Vocation, as applied here to the Church and in *1 Cor.* 7 to the "secular" callings, supplies us with the Christian sublimation of ambition. A sense of Vocation is the true and only sublimation of ambition. As opposed to the spirit that would discover and carve out a coveted position for itself, is the spirit that waits on bended knee for the guidance of God, then faithfully performs it. As against the other spirit, too common in our robotical age, that destiny is determined for or rather against us by fate or chance or accident, is this doctrine of Vocation which means

the purpose of grace which a personal God has for us as persons, living in fellowship in the community of faith.

But Vocation is a principle of social integration as well as of social articulation. The Kingdom of God is also meant to be a "cosmos of callings", where each finds the place and work best fitted to his capacities, and serves God in it "with a perfect heart".

The ecclesiastical diversity which has been a feature of Christianity since its earliest days is an indication that there must always be differences of gifts and of vocation within the Body of Christ. Just as the variations in conscience from individual to individual are no proof that conscience is unreliable, but on the contrary show how concrete and practical conscience actually is, so the diversity of our attitudes in belief and procedure points to the varying contributions we are meant to bring to the Kingdom of God. Now we see through a glass darkly, we only know bit by bit. None of us has a monopoly of truth. God is not a Presbyterian, nor was Jesus even a European. The old Wesleyan lay preacher quaintly read in *Rev.* 21, "and the twelfth was a Methodist". Unconsciously we each think our own is the only possible language of Canaan, like the old Scots landlady, whose lodger lay at the point of death, and "the puir laddie hadna a word o' the Gaelic, and he wadna ken what they said to him on the ither side". We are all more or less like that, but few of us are humble and wise enough to recognize the difference between our principles and our prejudices.

This does not lay us under any obligation to encourage and justify the aberrations and demonic pretensions of sectarianism; but it should open our eyes to certain things inherent both in the Gospel and in human nature, which make ecclesiastical uniformity as obsolete an ideal as the Holy Roman Empire. Even granted that denominational convictions and loyalties for many of us have no justification except that of "irrational" tradition and custom, still no good thing can come out of attempts to assimilate or sweep away our distinctive denominational characteristics in favour of a featureless Catholicity, which, aiming at being œcumenical, succeeds at best in becoming scarcely and merely Roman. It is in accordance with the lessons of history to maintain that the Church has usually been most serviceable to God and most faithful in its witness to truth and righteousness and freedom as a broken Body. It may be that there is a fundamental mystical reason and necessity in this, involved in the genius of our Faith. The Church crucified is for this earth, because it is not of this earth: the Church glorified is for heaven, where the temptations which in this imperfect world always beset the exercise of power can no longer pervert it from its purity and its mission. It is possible so to glorify the Church as a dominating institution that it loses its power to redeem the world. Indeed, that is part of the abiding message of the Reformation.

The genius of Protestantism will always reveal itself in ecclesiastical diversities. Are we to deplore these as wilful perversions of the mind and purpose of God, or are we to respect them as historical and spiritual realities, with much more than a sentimental value? The future of Protestantism, and with it of the world, depends on our decision. There is no merit in non-conformity, but the ideal for the Church of Christ is not uniformity but charity. The forces that challenge our faith are now so ruthless and implacable that all is lost unless we take the Reformation more instead of less seriously, and press further our Protestant interpretation of the Gospel and that doctrine of the Church which is bound up with it. And in our attitude to our ecclesiastical institutions we must beware of the mistake, too often made in the history of the Church, of building up an efficient organization, which the first breath of the Spirit in revival must scatter to the four winds of heaven, in the interests of the Kingdom of grace. "The watchword of genuine Churchmanship is never 'the Church', but always and only 'Jesus Christ' ".

The election of Dr. Oscar E. Maurer to the Moderatorship of the General Council of Congregational Churches of the U.S.A. comes very appropriately in the year when the First Church of Christ in New Haven (of which he has been pastor for nearly 30 years) is celebrating its Tercentenary. In *A Puritan Church and Its Relation to Community, State and Nation* (Yale Press, $2.00) he tells the story of the three centuries, and prints the Tercentenary Address delivered by him on April 24th. Few Englishmen understand the relationship between the early New England churches and the community in the 17th century, and Dr. Maurer's history is specially valuable from this point of view. Center Church has had a fine record and a distinguished list of ministers, now fitly chronicled in this volume. Attention is needed to some of the English names—Capper and Thacher (p. 3) and Gilbert (p. 193) are unduly disguised.

Two very readable books on Japan are before us—Mr. A. Morgan Young's *Imperial Japan* (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.) and Prof. G. C. Allen's *Japan: The Hungry Guest* (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.). Prof. Allen's is much the better of the two, for, detailed and informing as it is, Mr. Young's is too obviously anti-Japanese to convince doubters: in statements like "All Japan loves a murder", Mr. Young has forgotten Burke's dictum that it is impossible to indict a nation. Mr. Young is a journalist and was editor of the *Japan Chronicle* for many years, and this book, like its predecessor, *Japan under Taisho Tenno, 1912-1926,* has the liveliness of one who has seen affairs at first hand. So has Prof. Allen, whose three years of College life in Japan from 1922-1925 have just been supplemented by a visit for the purpose of research into Japanese industry. While Prof. Allen does not fail to be critical of the Japanese, his chapters show understanding of the country's problems: those dealing with Japanese life reveal a real sympathy with the masses of the Japanese people. His book can be safely recommended to those who desire to learn about the Japan of today.

THE HYMNS OF DR. ISAAC WATTS[1].

By B. L. Manning, M.A.

Dr. Henry Bett and Dr. Albert Peel have recently revived the respectable game of comparing the hymns of Watts and the hymns of Wesley. I shall have to take a turn or two at it myself before I finish this paper. Indeed, no one can read Watts without having Wesley in mind, and nothing will enable a man to see the greatness of Watts's hymns so well as a thorough knowledge of Wesley's. I make no apology then for beginning and continuing and ending with the comparison at the back of my mind. Watts himself began the game when he said with the generosity of a Congregationalist and the exaggeration of a preacher that Wesley's *Wrestling Jacob* was worth all that he himself had ever written.

This paper is about Dr. Watts's hymns, not about Dr. Watts. We must, for all that, take a look at Dr. Watts himself. He was born in 1674 and died at the age of 74 in 1748. His life, that is to say, covered the period in which Protestant Dissent won its permanent place in English society. When Watts was born Protestant Dissent was proscribed and persecuted. When he was a boy there occurred the decisive struggle with Popery and the Popish King, James II. The Glorious Revolution of 1688 brought security to the Church of England and Toleration to Protestant Dissenters. When Watts was in middle life the end of the Stuarts and the accession of the House of Hanover marked the failure of the Tory attack on the settlement of 1688, an attack aimed especially at the Dissenters, but promising a revival of Popery too. At the very end of his life Dr. Watts had the satisfaction of witnessing in the failure of the '45 the collapse of the Young Pretender, and the final deliverance of Great Britain from the dangers that had menaced it since the death of Oliver Cromwell. The Constitution was saved from Divine Right. Protestantism was saved from France and the Pope. Dissent was saved from Toryism and persecution. Watts, then, was one of those fortunate persons whose life coincides with the increasing triumph of his own cause. The right people win. The wicked are cast down. All things—visibly—work together for good to them that love God. The note of cheerfulness—perhaps the most distinct note in Watts's poetry—comes appropriately from such a setting.

That is the setting. We glance now at the career. Watts's grandfather was a naval officer who served under Blake, the Cromwellian admiral, one of our greatest naval heroes. Watts's father, as became a Dissenter after the collapse of the Rule of the Saints, led

[1] A paper read to the University Congregational Society in Cambridge on Sunday, 17th October, 1937.

a humbler life. He was in business in Southampton. But remember the grandfather and observe Watts's rather warlike patriotism, his pride in the "sceptred isle", "set in the silver sea", in the navy which protects it, in the naval traditions of our race. All this, which comes leaking through Watts's pious prayers for Britain, reminds us of Blake's lieutenant. Watts himself was two things: a minister and a scholar, great in each work. His studies ruined his health. In 1712, just before he was 40, he went to live with Sir Thomas Abney, of Abney Park, and he spent the rest of his life there. He did not completely abandon the active ministry, however, and at the time of his death he was something like a national figure. He has a memorial in Westminster Abbey. About his scholarship we observe that, vast as it was, he amassed it under the difficulties which hampered all Dissenters till 1870. He was excluded from Oxford and Cambridge, and went to a Dissenting academy. The academies tried to do what the national universities refused to do for Dissenters. Compared with Oxford and Cambridge the academies had many disadvantages, but they had one notable advantage. On them the dead hand of mathematics and classics lay less heavily. They developed a wider notion of education. Philosophy, natural science, history, modern languages found a place. Accordingly Dr. Watts possessed an encyclopædic sort of scholarship, less fine and nice, it might be, in the classics than the most polished Oxford man of his time might have, but vastly wider in scope and more liberal in tendency. I do not mean that Dr. Watts knew little Greek and Latin. He was accomplished in both; but he knew other things too.

So much, but no more, does it seem necessary to say by way of introducing the author. We now open the book: *The Psalms of David imitated in New Testament Language together with Hymns and Spiritual Songs*. It has two parts, as the title indicates, and they are of about equal length. In the first part Dr. Watts presents a metrical version of the book of psalms. It is not a mere reproduction of the 150 psalms. Some are omitted. Some are abbreviated. Some are represented by more than one version in different metres. Some are divided into several parts. All are baptized into the Christian faith. But Watts shall tell you in his own words what he has done.

> It is necessary to divest *David* and *Asaph*, &c. of every other Character but that of a *Psalmist* and a *Saint*, and to *make them always speak the common Sense of a Christian*. . . . . Where the Psalmist describes Religion by the *Fear* of God, I have often joined *Faith and Love* to it:. . . . Where he talks of sacrificing *Goats or Bullocks*, I rather chuse to mention the Sacrifice of *Christ, the Lamb of God*: Where he attends the *Ark with Shouting* in *Zion*, I sing the *Ascension of my Saviour* into Heaven, or his *Presence in his Church* on Earth.

The second part of the book contains hymns. First comes a book of hymns "collected from the Holy Scriptures", that is to say paraphrases of both Old and New Testament passages. Second is a book of hymns "composed on Divine Subjects", that is to say hymns as we should understand the word, freely composed without particular reference to Holy Scripture. Third, and last, are hymns "prepared for the holy ordinance of the Lord's Supper". As Watts had ended his Psalter by six versions of *Gloria Patri* in various metres, so he ends the hymn book by others. Some are in the form of hymns. Some are single verses. To these he adds four hosannas to the Son of God. The result is a very substantial volume.

I shall not pretend to any bibliographical knowledge of Watts's works. If you want that knowledge you will find it in Julian's *Dictionary of Hymnology*. I mention only that the *Hymns* were published in 1707 and enlarged in a second edition in 1709; and that ten years later the *Psalms* were published. We will take the volume as it stands compacted of these two.

Nor shall I give you, what I am indeed unfit to give you, an historical sketch of hymn singing in our churches. I note only that Watts is a pioneer. Hymns were being sung in our churches in the late 17th century; but there was a prejudice against them as both Popish and unscriptural. That prejudice died hard; and, what was worse, the supply of English hymns was meagre and poor. To Watts more than to any other man is due the triumph of the hymn in English worship. All later hymn-writers, even when they excel him, are his debtors; and it is possible to hold that his work for hymns is greater than Charles Wesley's, even if as a writer of hymns we place him a little lower than Wesley. Metrical psalms in great numbers there were before Watts, and they were much used. But here, as in his hymns, Watts was a pioneer. In his Christian interpretation of the Psalms, he had predecessors, but no one had so thoroughly carried out the plan before.

In examining what Dr. Watts wrote we must then always remember that he is hewing his way through an almost unexplored territory and that his successors, not having his rough work to do again, will be able to polish and improve. We must expect him to make many experiments that fail, and to try many arrangements before he finds the best. His book is a laboratory of experiments. Only in a few places can we expect him to bring one off. Another set of conditions hampered him. He was writing for congregations that were often ignorant. His hymns had to be suitable to be announced and sung line by line by illiterates. He had to write in only a few well-known metres, a limitation of which he often complained.

I claim at this point the historian's privilege: the privilege of mentioning dates. The hymns were published in 1707. Watts's

mind, that is to say, was formed in the 17th century. He is a 17th, rather than an 18th, century writer. This appears in that quality of his verse which friends call quaint, and enemies grotesque. When Watts's taste was set the English language had not undergone that purging and purifying, that rationalizing and simplification, which we associate with the name of Addison. Here we find a contrast between Watts and Wesley. Watts's forebears wrote crabbed, allusive, tortuous prose and verse. Charles Wesley's forebears wrote the slick and polished stuff. To write great theology in common metre, long metre, or in 6.8's is not easy even if you have a perfect command of metre; but Watts found no metre ready tamed for his use. Read the metrical psalter of the Church of Scotland, and you will get a picture of the untamed, unbroken metres which Watts had to discipline. Wesley found that work done for him. The wonder is not that Watts is, when compared with Wesley, rough and grotesque, but that he has achieved even his moderate success in harnessing his verse to his theology. Here is an example at random from Psalm 20: "Some trust in chariots and some in horses: but we will remember the name of the Lord our God". The Scottish version is:

In chariots some put confidence,
Some horses trust upon;
But we remember will the name
Of our Lord God alone.

Watts writes:

Some trust in horses train'd for war,
And some of chariots make their boasts;
Our surest expectations are
From Thee, the Lord of heav'nly hosts.

I have not chosen a grotesque, but an average, passage. But you can see Watts smoothing the verses down. In the eighteenth century they will be smoothed quite flat.

From the seventeenth century Watts derived another quality which makes him very unlike Wesley. This quality reminds us of Milton, even though the difference between Milton and Watts is very great. Let me put it this way. Charles Wesley in his hymns concerns himself mainly (I had almost written exclusively) with God and the soul of man: their manifold relations, their estrangement, their reconciliation, their union. Watts, too, concerns himself with this drama; but he gives it a cosmic background. Not less than Wesley he finds the Cross the centre of his thought: all things look forward or backward to the Incarnation and the Passion. But Watts sees the Cross, as Milton had seen it, planted on a globe hung in space, surrounded by the vast distances of the universe. He sees the drama in Palestine prepared before the beginning of time and still

decisive when time has ceased to be. There is a sense of the spaciousness of nature, of the vastness of time, of the dreadfulness of eternity, in Watts which is missing or less felt in Wesley. You have a touch of it in the last verse of Watts's greatest and best-known hymn, "When I survey". "Were *the whole realm of nature* mine": the whole realm of nature—no thought, no expression is more characteristic of Watts than that. It is an echo of his encyclopædic philosophic thought. You constantly find Watts "surveying" the whole realm of nature and finding at the centre of it its crucified and dying Creator.

In the most hideous period of the last war, in a rather dingy, dreary chapel in the Potteries, I heard Dr. F. B. Meyer preach (as only he could) on the Passion. He took for his text Watts's hymn "When I survey"; and to this day I can give you the headings and gist of that moving sermon. I recall what Dr. Meyer said about the word *survey*: a cold, rather formal word for the sinner's looking at the Saviour, he thought it, but it was (he admitted) very characteristic of Watts. It is the word of a man who, in seventeenth century fashion, sees the world in a grain of sand and eternity in an hour. John Bailey says that in no poet are we so frequently made aware of the sky as in Milton. In this Watts is Milton's disciple. The spaciousness of the firmament is always appearing in his hymns, and he cannot glance or look at so vast an expanse of time and space as the scene of our redemption unfolds: he must *survey* it.

> Ere the blue heavens were stretched abroad
> From everlasting was the Word.

There is a magical quality in that verse. Watts knows that the "blue heavens" alone provide an adequate background for any thought of the Word. It is like Milton. It is like Dante. It has sublimity. That sublimity was partly lost in the intense examination of the human soul which marked the evangelical and pietist movements, but in Watts it leads straight to the Calvinist's awareness of the sovereignty of God.

> God is a name my soul adores
> The almighty Three, the eternal One;
> Nature and grace, with all their powers,
> Confess the Infinite unknown.
>
> Thy voice produced the sea and spheres,
> Bade the waves roar, the planets shine;
> But nothing like Thyself appears
> Through all these spacious works of Thine.
>
> Still restless nature dies and grows,
> From change to change the creatures run;
> Thy being no succession knows,
> And all Thy vast designs are one.

A glance of Thine runs through the globe,
Rules the bright worlds, and moves their frame;
Of light Thou form'st Thy dazzling robe,
Thy ministers are living flame.

How shall polluted mortals dare
To sing Thy glory or Thy grace?
Beneath Thy feet we lie afar,
And see but shadows of Thy face.

Who can behold the blazing light?
Who can approach consuming flame?
None but Thy wisdom knows Thy might,
None but Thy word can speak Thy name.

These verses, though less august, show the same perception of the great realm of nature.

Firm are the words His prophets give,
Sweet words, on which his children live;
Each of them is the voice of God
Who spoke and spread the skies abroad.

Each of them powerful as the sound
That bid the new-made world go round;
And stronger than the solid poles
On which the wheel of nature rolls.

O for a strong, a lasting faith
To credit what my Maker saith,
T'embrace the message of His Son
And call the joys of heaven our own!

Then, should the earth's old pillars shake
And all the wheels of nature break,
Our steady souls should fear no more
Than solid rocks when billows roar.

Our everlasting hopes arise
Above the ruinable skies,
Where the eternal Builder reigns,
And His own courts His power sustains.

It is not, I think, an accident that the Methodists have drawn so freely on this type of hymn by Watts. Charles Wesley himself provided them with ample riches in the expression of evangelical faith; but the genius which presided over the evolution of the Methodist hymn book consciously or unconsciously understood that Watts could supplement Wesley on this other side. In this way it has come about that the Methodists have a splendid store of Watts's hymns on what we may pretentiously call the cosmic setting of the Faith. They have valued Watts in some ways more than we.

The verses that I last quoted contain two interesting words from which we may now jump to consider Watts's diction. Did you note

the fine phrase "above the ruinable skies"? Watts has a flair for the use of the memorable word. We shall find that as we proceed. The other word is *old*: "should the earth's old pillars shake". Unless you are very careful that sounds ludicrous. We want Watts to say *ancient* or to use a more dignified word. *Old* is a word that has lost caste since 1709. Compare

> The sons of good old Jacob seem'd
> Abandon'd to their foes.

Unhappily for Watts, many of his words have lost caste; and verse after verse of his psalms and hymns we find ruined by a turn of phrase that, once venerable, is become comic. The great divide, I surmise, is somewhere near Addison. Words have changed less since then. That is why Wesley seems less archaic or "dated" than Watts, though of course there are a few expressions in Wesley that strike us as odd. But there are many in Watts. Very much too often we descend from the sublime to the ridiculous with a shattering bump, or, when he wishes to move us he makes us squirm.

> Here every bowel of our God
> With soft compassion rolls.

Not merely by his fondness for "bowels" and "worms" does Watts disturb us, but by scores and scores of expressions that died in the polite reformation of Augustan English.

So much then we must expect for the simple but adequate reason that Watts's taste was formed in the 17th and not in the 18th century. As an example, let me quote Watts's use of the exclamation *Well*. He is very fond of this, but it gives a grotesquely colloquial touch to some of his solemn passages. He is contrasting the eternal life of God with the transitoriness of His creatures.

> The sea and sky must perish too,
> And vast destruction come;
> The creatures—look, how old they grow
> And wait their fiery doom.
>
> Well, let the sea shrink all away
> And flame melt down the skies;
> My God shall live an endless day
> When th'old creation dies.

Or, in another sense, he opens a hymn:

> Well, the Redeemer's gone
> T'appear before our God,
> To sprinkle o'er the flaming throne
> With his atoning blood.

Or

> Well, if our days must fly,
> We'll keep their end in sight.

Bible readers will remember that the translators of the Authorized Version in their address to the Reader use "Well" in a similar solemn manner. It is part of Watts's seventeenth century inheritance.

I could fill pages with examples of this unhappy change in the meaning of Watts's words.

> Thou has redeem'd our souls from hell
> With Thine *invaluable* blood.

> Yet with my God I leave my cause,
> And trust His promised grace;
> He rules me by His *well-known* laws
> Of love and righteousness.

> [God] rides upon the stormy sky
> And *manages* the seas.

> Thee, mighty God, our souls *admire*.

> Must heaven's eternal *darling* die
> To save a traitrous race?

> And Heaven without Thy presence there
> Would be a dark and *tiresome* place.

and, perhaps oddest of all,

> Through all His (God's) ancient works
> *Surprising* wisdom shines.

Examples leap from every page. These will suffice to explain why so many of Watts's hymns cannot be sung to-day.

At times it is not the odd word, but the quaint or crude thought which puts the psalm or hymn out of court. Watts out-Wordsworths Wordsworth in his love of simple everyday language; and as Wordsworth at times made the sublime ridiculous by his kindergarten expressions so also did Watts. At its best Watts's language is pure and transparent. It is as pure Anglo-Saxon as Bunyan's own:

> Sweet fields beyond that swelling flood
> Stand dressed in living green.

But at its worst it is banal beyond belief. What modern versions of St. Paul's epistles have done for *Romans* and *Ephesians* Watts has done for the Psalms. The obscurity has gone: granted; but so has the awe, the majesty, the numinous, the divine. Here is a neutral example about manna:

> But they in murmuring language said
> "Manna is all our feast.
> We loathe this light, this airy bread,
> We must have flesh to taste".

"Ye shall have flesh to please your lust"
(The Lord in wrath replied)
And sent them quails like sand or dust,
Heap'd up from side to side.

He gave them all their own desire;
And greedy as they fed,
His vengeance burnt with secret fire,
And smote the rebels dead.

And meritorious as Watts's use of Anglo-Saxon words is, free as he is of pompous rubbish, his exclusion of Latin words deprives him of those magical changes that Wesley knows so well how to use. By the introduction of a word like *essential* or *transient* among Anglo-Saxon words Wesley will strike a deep note in a way that holds you spell-bound. When he would be strong, Watts is often merely violent.

At times, however, his violence becomes grand:

They love the road that leads to hell;
Then let the rebels die
Whose malice is implacable
Against the Lord on high.

But if thou hast a chosen few
Amongst that impious race,
Divide then from the bloody crew
By Thy surprising grace.

On Judgment Day:

The angry nations fret and roar
That they can slay the saints no more;
On wings of vengeance flies our God
To pay the long arrears of blood.

On Satan:

Now Satan comes with dreadful roar,
And threatens to destroy;
He worries whom he can't devour
With a malicious joy.

On the other hand, we have this pleasing picture of supernatural natural history:

A thousand savage beasts of prey
Around the forest roam,
But Judah's Lion guards the way
And guides the strangers home.

Here is the *Warning to Magistrates,* to the Tory invaders of the rights of conscience who attempted to undermine the Toleration Act. It is worth the attention of Stalin and Hitler:

Yet you invade the rights of God,
And send your bold decrees abroad
To bind the conscience in your chains.

Break out their teeth, eternal God,
Those teeth of lions dyed in blood,
And crush the serpents in the dust.
As empty chaff, when whirlwinds rise,
Before the sweeping tempest flies,
So let their hopes and names be lost.

But Watts was sometimes a master of understatement, as well as sometimes a slave of exaggeration. There is a neatness about this next verse which makes even *Esquire* seem cumbrous. Watts is writing on the excellency of the Christian religion :

Not the feign'd fields of heathenish bliss
Could raise such pleasures to the mind,
Nor does the Turkish Paradise
Pretend to joys so well-refined.

You notice that, even when he is most grotesque, he lets slip the great phrase. "The feign'd fields of heathenish bliss" might be Milton. "To pay the long arrears of blood" might be Shakespeare. Might it not be Aeschylus?

One other quality that has not helped the hymns demands a word. Watts, it must be confessed, is not always very clever at rhymes. Something must be allowed for changes in pronunciation of vowels and diphthongs. Something may be due to a faulty ear. But much, I am persuaded, is due to haste and carelessness. Have you noticed how many poor rhymes, false rhymes, and mere assonances occur even in his great hymns? Watts rarely tries to rhyme more than the second and fourth lines. That, to begin with, is letting himself off easily. Contrast Wesley, who usually rhymes first and third as well as second and fourth, and so gets a more compact verse. Take as an example "Jesus shall reign". In six verses, with twelve alleged rhymes, we find no fewer than five of the twelve imperfect. Watts is in this matter distinctly inferior to Wesley, who had, of course, a gifted musical ear and a rare facility in Latin verse to help him. Wesley's book, as well as Watts's, contains of course a a good many false rhymes and mere assonances, but Wesley's do not weaken his verse as much as one would at first expect. This is because, unlike Watts, Wesley leaves very few lines without some attempt at rhyming. If lines two and four rhyme badly, lines one and three partly save the situation for Wesley. Watts has too often neglected to provide himself with this safety valve, and one bad rhyme, being the only rhyme, puts the verse out of action. So marked is the difference that if you read a hundred pages of Watts

at a sitting, and come (as you will come) on the hymn perfectly smoothed and perfectly rhymed, your inclination is to say, "Why, Wesley might have written that!", for at his best Watts is as accomplished as Wesley.

I take two of Watts's smoothest examples. You will note how much they gain because here, like Wesley, he sets out to rhyme lines one and three as well as two and four. Even here, however, Watts does not give us perfect rhymes:

Not all the outward forms on earth,
  Nor rites that God has given,
Nor will of man, nor blood, nor birth,
  Can raise a soul to Heaven.

The sovereign will of God alone
  Creates us heirs of grace,
Born in the image of His Son,
  A new, peculiar race.

Or this:

Nor eye has seen, nor ear has heard,
  Nor sense, nor reason known,
What joys the Father has prepared
  For those that love the Son.

Each verse has one false and one true rhyme. Spread this defective rhyming equally all over the psalms and hymns and you see the result is considerable and depressing.

You will perhaps assume from what I have said that the common opinion is true, that our hymn books have selected the best of Watts, and that we are not missing much in missing all but the 25 hymns or so with which we are familiar. Let no word of mine lead you into that damnable error. When every deduction for every reason has been made, Watts's psalms and hymns contain many, many pieces which would enrich our worship. Not a few, it is true, contain a phrase or word that is now comic or grotesque; but by no means all. And even those hymns which, for such reasons, we cannot sing in public, we neglect at our peril in private. I at least know of no devotional book richer than Watts's hymns and psalms. The whole piece may be unfit for use, but the great phrase, the great thought, the penetrating analysis, the blinding flash of genius lighting up Calvary afresh for us—these things would purge and wring and subdue and elevate and all but save our souls, did we give them the chance. Watts's was a great mind, a great soul, a great experience. Much that he writes is too intimate except for the holy of holies. But we ought to use it there.

Everyone will make his own selection. I should have been sorry to miss this meditation:

Here at Thy cross, my dying God,
I lay my soul beneath Thy love.

Not all that tyrants think, or say,
With rage and lightning in their eyes,
Nor hell shall fright my heart away,
Should hell with all its legions rise,

Should worlds conspire to drive me thence,
Moveless and firm this heart should lie,
Resolv'd (for that's my last defence)
If I must perish, there to die.

* * *

There I behold, with sweet delight,
The blessed Three in One;
And strong affections fix my sight
On God's incarnate Son.

* * *

And if no evening visit's paid
Between my Saviour and my soul,
How dull the night, how sad the shade,
How mournfully the minutes roll.

* * *

Deep in our hearts let us record
The deeper sorrows of our Lord.

* * *

The mount of danger is the place
Where we shall see surprising grace.

* * *

Turn, turn us, mighty God,
And mould our souls afresh;
Break, sovereign grace, these hearts of stone,
And give us hearts of flesh.

It is time, after examining the limitations, to observe the strong features of Watts's verse. We have glanced at the simple Anglo-Saxon words which compose it. Page after page shows no Latin word. Whole verses are in monosyllables. The experiment is too difficult to succeed always, but if it comes off it is heavenly in its clarity and light. You can notice this in everything that I quote from Watts.

There are few tricks in Watts's verse, but he is fond of some simple devices. These interest us because first we can watch him practising them in scores of feeble or moderate verses, and then using them to bring off some distinguished performance in a classic hymn.

He is very fond, for instance, of a sort of repetition or parallelism. This descends perhaps from his putting into verse so many of the parallel sentences of Hebrew poetry. At times he repeats an idea, at times a phrase, at times only a word.

Down to the earth was Satan thrown,
Down to the earth his legions fell.

High on the cross the Saviour hung,
High in the heavens he reigns.

To Jesus our atoning Priest,
To Jesus our superior King.

I'll make your great commission known,
And ye shall prove my gospel true
By all the works that I have done,
By all the wonders ye shall do.

A more interesting type is here:

He bids the sun forbear to rise,
Th' obedient sun forbears.

In the creation

"Let blood," He said, "flow round the veins",
And round the veins it flows.

Note the chiasmus there too.

Our days alas! our mortal days
Are short and wretched too;
"Evil and few" the patriarch says,
And well the patriarch knew.

Watts is particularly fond of pairing his lines in a way of his own. Most writers pair lines one and two or three and four, and Watts often does that too. But he very often secures an interesting effect by pairing lines two and three:

Nor shall Thy spreading Gospel rest
Till through the world Thy truth has run,
Till Christ has all the nations bless'd
That see the light or feel the sun.

Down to this base, this sinful earth,
He came to raise our nature high;
He came t' atone almighty wrath,
Jesus, the God, was born to die.

Not very remarkable, you may say. Wait a moment. Turn now to the greatest of Watts's hymns, and see this particular form of parallelism, combined with a chiasmus, in the second and third lines of the verse. See Watts bring off with apparently artless art the performance for which he has practised scores and scores of times:

See from His head, His hands, His feet,
Sorrow and love flow mingled down.
Did e'er such love and sorrow meet,
Or thorns compose so rich a crown?

Another device of which Watts is very fond is accumulation. He piles up words and ideas of the same order, and produces the effect memorably described in Burke's treatise, *On the Sublime and Beautiful*:

His worship and his fear shall last
Till hours and years and time be past.

* * *

(There Persia, glorious to behold,
There India shines in eastern gold)
And barb'rous nations at His word
Submit and bow and own their Lord.

* * *

No bleeding bird, nor bleeding beast,
Nor hyssop branch, nor sprinkling priest,
Nor running brook, nor flood, nor sea,
Can wash the dismal stain away.

Sometimes Watts accumulates phrases, as when Wisdom speaks:

Before the flying clouds,
  Before the solid land,
Before the fields, before the floods,
  I dwelt at His right hand.

Not much in it? Perhaps not; but, for all that, you will find it a feature of the greatest of his hymns:

See from His head, His hands, His feet.

* * *

While life and thought and being last,
  Or immortality endures.

* * *

Such as trust their native strength
  Shall melt away and droop and die.

From Milton I suspect Watts learnt his mastery of proper names. They adorn his verse frequently and happily. Sometimes they strike us as odd.

He takes my soul ere I'm aware,
And shows me where His glories are;
No chariot of Amminadib
The heavenly rapture can describe.

Or

So Samson, when his hair was lost,
Met the Philistines to his cost,
Shook his vain limbs with sad surprise,
Made feeble fight, and lost his eyes.

But this is impressive:

What mighty man, or mighty God,
  Comes travelling in State
Along the Idumæan road
  Away from Bozrah's gate?

And have you noticed the triumph of long practice with proper names in "There is a land of pure delight"? In one couplet Watts works off three of them. We do not notice them as heavy or precious; and yet they awaken that historic memory which only proper names can command:

So to the Jews old Canaan stood,
While Jordan roll'd between.

Watts has achieved perfect mastery when he can use proper names to bewitch us without our noticing it.

You remember that other quality which we observed earlier: Watts's awareness of the whole universe as the setting for human life and for the drama of salvation. That quality gives deep tones to his greatest hymns. That, too, he controls after much experiment. I need only remind you of

Time, like an ever-rolling stream.

* * *

The busy tribes of flesh and blood,
With all their lives and cares,
Are carried downwards by thy flood
And lost in following years.

* * *

Thee, Mighty God, whose matchless power
Is ever new and ever young,
And firm endures while endless years
Their everlasting circles run.

And of course supremely:

Were the whole realm of nature mine.

Watts, then, achieves his supreme triumphs not by accident. They are compounded of many ingredients already well known to him, experimented with happily and unhappily, carelessly as well as carefully, but finally subdued by his art in a classic hymn. For some of the hymns as whole pieces, notably for "When I survey" and for "There is a land", we can find rough drafts in his book.

We have lingered perhaps too long on the lesser things. Let me ask a final question touching greater matters than diction and versification. What of Watts's choice of subjects? What are the psalms and hymns about?

They concern, as is natural, some things of passing or historic interest. In making David speak like a Christian, Watts most properly made him speak also like an Englishman, not to say like an eighteenth century Whig. Watts equates, that is to say, Palestine, Israel, Judea, Jerusalem with Great Britain. The exquisitely sensitive commentators call this vulgar. Vulgar or not, Watts does it. The result is that he gives us some fascinating reflexions on English history. The deliverances of the chosen people had their parallels in Gunpowder Plot, the landing of William of Orange, the accession of George I, and generally in the defeat of the French, the discomfiture of the Tories, and the confusion of the Papists. "Popish idolatry reproved: a psalm for the 5th of November"; "The church saved and her enemies disappointed: composed for the 5th of

November, 1694" ; "Power and government from God alone : applied to the Glorious Revolution by King William or the happy accession of King George to the throne". The hymns are full of sound political doctrine as well as thanksgiving.

Britain was doomed to be a slave,
Her frame dissolved, her fears were great,
When God a new supporter gave
To bear the pillars of the State.

* * *

No vain pretence to royal birth
Shall fix a tyrant on the throne.

The lesson is clear :

Oft has the Lord whole nations bless'd
For His own church's sake;
The pow'rs that give His people rest
Shall of His care partake.

* * *

Let Cæsar's due be ever paid
To Cæsar and his throne,
But consciences and souls were made
To be the Lord's alone.

Here is Guy Fawkes :

Their secret fires in caverns lay,
And we the sacrifice;
But gloomy caverns strove in vain
To 'scape all searching eyes.

Their dark designs were all revealed,
Their treason all betray'd.

But nevertheless :

In vain the busy sons of hell
Still new rebellions try.

The grandson of Blake's lieutenant rejoices in the success of our arms, in the cause of liberty and Protestantism :

How have we chas'd them through the field,
And trod them to the ground,
While Thy salvation was our shield,
But they no shelter found.

* * *

In vain to idol saints they cry,
And perish in their blood.

The decline of the Dissenting interest in the early 18th century has left a pathetic reflexion in Watts. Empty churches are not new phenomena.

'Tis with a mournful pleasure now
I think on ancient days;
Then to Thy house did numbers go,
And all our work was praise.

In God they boasted all the day,
And in a cheerful throng
Did thousands meet to praise and pray,
And grace was all their song.

But now our souls are seiz'd with shame,
Confusion fills our face.

* * *

Yet have we not forgot our God,
Nor falsely dealt with heav'n.

Most of the psalms and hymns contain no local or passing reference. They deal—ninety-nine out of a hundred of them—with the great elemental facts that always dominate the Christian's mind. There is indeed a certain sameness about Watts's book because he deals so constantly with the same three or four topics. There is nothing denominational about him. We find rather less reflexion of the intense fellowship of classic Congregationalism than we should have expected. Watts deals with the great common themes of catholic Christianity.

There is, to begin with, the most frank and most moving recital of the weakness, the unsatisfactoriness, the transience of human life. The hopes and fears of men Watts portrays with a tender but unflinching hand. No man has analysed more faithfully the doubts and hopes and fears that we all have.

The passions of my hope and fear
Maintain'd a doubtful strife,
While sorrow, pain, and sin conspir'd
To take away my life.

And all is set over against the vast universe:

Like flowery fields the nations stand,
Pleas'd with the morning light;
The flow'rs beneath the mower's hand
Lie with'ring ere 'tis night.

Watts is almost Virgilian in this. Not less than Virgil he deserves Tennyson's great word:

Thou majestic in thy sadness
At the doubtful doom of human kind.

There is no easy sentimentality in Watts. He has one foot firmly on earth. His quite ghastly poems about death and the grave, about hell and Satan, provide valuable evidence that he at least had allowed for the emergence of Mussolini and Hitler and Stalin. Watts is a sound Calvinist. He knows that mankind has fallen. He takes full note of evil, and allows handsomely for it.

But if one of Watts's feet is firmly planted on earth, the other is no less firmly planted on catholic, evangelical, apostolic theology. A line which, for another purpose, I have already quoted gives us in

strong epigrammatic form the other thing which Watts sees over against the tragedy of human life.

Jesus, the God, was born to die.

In its blazing antitheses: the Galilean carpenter who is God: the God who is born: the God who dies: it carries us back to the most ancient hymns of the Greek and the Latin Church.

Our souls adore th' Eternal God,
Who condescended to be born.

The Incarnation, the Passion, the Resurrection—these things are for Watts no less certain than the frustration of human hopes. That is why (in his own word) he is, on the balance, "cheerful".

Till God in human form I see
My thoughts no comfort find.
* * *
But if Immanuel's face I see
My hope, my joy begins.

I love th' incarnate mystery
And there I place my trust.

Here is the final vision of a Love of God older than the universe and filling it:

So strange, so boundless was the love
That pitied dying men,
The Father sent His equal Son
To give them life again.

"Christ be my first elect," He said,
Then chose our souls in Christ our head,
Before He gave the mountains birth
Or laid foundations for the earth.

Thus did eternal love begin
To raise us up from death and sin;
Our characters were then decreed
"Blameless in love, a holy seed."

So let our lips and lives confess
That holy gospel we profess.

Now by the bowels of my God,
His sharp distress, His sore complaints,
By His last groans, His dying blood,
I charge my soul to love the saints.

Tender and kind be all our thoughts,
Through all our lives let mercy run;
So God forgives our numerous faults
For the dear sake of Christ His Son.

These are the august notes of true Catholic theology and true Christian living. I know of no better introduction to classical

theology than Watts. Let me give you two examples. Recently I read through the Gloss Ordinary and the other main commentaries used by medieval theologians on the first few chapters of the *Song of Solomon*. I found it again almost word for word in Watts's paraphrases of that book. And in Watts's "Jesus shall reign" you have the great verse (omitted of course nowadays from our books because it is so great):

In Him (Christ) the sons of Adam boast
More blessings than their father lost.

What is that but the glorious passage from the ancient Office for Easter Eve? "O certainly necessary sin of Adam . . . O happy fault which deserved to have such and so great a Redeemer".

Watts's book moves to a splendid end in his sacramental hymns. The Lord's Supper has an essential place in Watts's religion.

I love the Lord, who stoops so low
To give His word a seal.
And thus our sense assists our faith[1]
And shows us what His gospel means.

He sets out the high sacramental doctrine of the Savoy Confession. The Lord's Supper is more than a memorial.

This holy bread and wine
Maintains our fainting breath
By union with our living Lord
And interest in His death.

Here have we seen Thy face, O Lord,
And view'd salvation with our eyes;
Tasted and felt the Living Word,
The bread descending from the skies.

He remembers with infinite tenderness those who once partook with us of the Supper here on earth.

While once upon this lower ground,
Weary and faint ye stood,
What dear refreshments here ye found
From this immortal food.

Here God's whole name appears complete,
Nor wit can guess, nor reason prove,
Which of the letters best is writ,
The power, the wisdom, or the love.

If I were asked to compare Watts with Wesley in a word, I should say, I think, though with great diffidence, that Watts seems to me to have the greater mind, the wider outlook, the more philosophic approach to human life and to the Christian revelation. He has also,

[1] St. Thomas Aquinas has the complementary thought in his great eucharistic hymn, *Pange, lingua*: Praestet fides supplementum
Sensuum defectui.

I think, more original poetry in him. Now and then he hits out a greater and more elemental phrase than any that I remember in Wesley. But Wesley is the greater artist. He flies more surely. He crashes far less often. He reaches the heights far more often, though perhaps he does not go quite as high. His book, as a whole, far surpasses Watts. Watts, because he is dominated by the notion of paraphrasing, puts Scripture very often into his own words; it is not always to the advantage of Scripture. Wesley does little paraphrasing. He puts his own notions into Scripture language, and it is always to their advantage. Each is scriptural; they are equally scriptural, but in different ways, and the literary luck is with Wesley. Watts had it in him to do better than Wesley ever did, better than he himself ever did.

But in essentials they are one; and they provide us with one quite conclusive reason for being Christians as far as we can be. They form a heritage that only a madman will let slip. Let Watts have the last word in the last lines of his superb doxology to the Holy Trinity:

Where reason fails,
With all her powers,
There faith prevails
And love adores.

Dr. James Parkes is successfully accomplishing the tremendous task he has set himself—the writing of a history of anti-Semitism. His first volume, *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue,* is now followed by *The Jew in the Medieval Community* (Soncino Press, 10s. 6d.), in which he concentrates on the political and economic aspects during the period, leaving the question of relations with Church and populace to another volume. Dr. Parkes is doing a fine piece of work—well-documented, objective, and with bibliographies appended to each section, of which there are three in this volume—"The Background", "The Political Status of the Jew", and "The Royal Usurer". He shows how the fall of Rome left the Jew in a position of insecurity and "rightlessness"; from the 4th century he was thrust into a position of inferiority, and the Church saw to it that he should not climb back into equality: the Church, indeed, would find it hard to rebut the charge that she was responsible for the fact that a Jew's loyalty to his faith meant psychological and social degradation, and for the massacres of the First Crusade. With usury came economic anti-Semitism; the Jew's usury "secured him official protection at the price of the public detestation". We look forward to the next volume.

THE MEANING OF CHRISTIANITY FOR THE COMMON MAN.

By Prof. H. Cunliffe-Jones, B.A., B.D., B.Litt.

I want to raise a question which I believe to be of the greatest importance, the question how far the message of the Christian Church is effectively understood to-day. In speaking of the meaning of Christianity for the common man I am thinking primarily of members or adherents of Christian Churches and only secondarily of people with no religious affiliation. It does matter what the average person of no great religious interest takes to be the central message of a religion persistently proclaimed in the community in which he lives. It matters even more that the average person who counts himself a Christian, though he be incapable of expounding the truths of the faith, shall be effectively seized with its religious content. There must always be a gap between the theologian and the ordinary member of a religious community; but this cannot be so large as to make the theologian the only one who *knows* what the religious message is. On the contrary the theologian must always be thought of as making clear the implications of religious beliefs that are common to every member as such. So the question I want to raise is this—is the common man effectively seized with the religious content of Christianity? My own answer to this question is *No*, and I am concerned to know what can be done about it. I do not pretend to more than an elementary knowledge of what people generally think about Christianity, but what I do know leads me to the belief that it is not adequate. If I may venture a rash generalization—we may think of our churches as containing an older and a younger element. The older people do understand Christianity as a religion, know how to maintain their own personal religion, and have a language in which they can express themselves. There is not always consistency between the parts of this appropriation of religion, and some elements may need purging and re-creating to be adequate to the Gospel; but it represents a real basis on which the worship of the living God may set us free to live. The younger element are more difficult to fathom—on the religious side. On the side of personal character, and willingness to take part in drudgery—acts of service for the benefit of any group they are associated with—there is a tremendous amount to give everyone encouragement. But it is difficult to estimate just what the *religious* significance of Christianity is to them. Not that it means nothing—on the contrary the depth of their religious awareness may astonish us; but there are gaps in their knowledge and an amount of sheer ignorance of which we do well to take account. And they have no common language in which the

meaning of Christianity can be expressed. Perhaps they have heard too many people speak about Christianity in such different ways that there seems no solid ground left. This is a crude and vague contrast I have sketched and though it may be challenged in numerous instances, I believe it represents a truth. And that truth is that we cannot be certain that the religious message of Christianity has been effectively conveyed to the present generation.

Two things every religious leader has to keep in mind: the people he is dealing with and the message he has to give. These two major influences cannot be made into one, for if he is concerned merely to say or do what corresponds to the minds of his people, he is only ministering to a group religious emotion, which derives its value and limitations from the character of the group. On the other hand, he must speak his message effectively to their condition, or it remains—for all its authority—without power: it does not work effectively in the lives of people. For this reason the question I am raising is not primarily a psychological one. It is not the detailed study of different opinions that may be held about the meaning of Christianity with which I am concerned, but what the different opinions have to teach us. They may teach us that the thinker must work a great deal harder in order that what are commonplaces to him shall be more generally understood; they may teach us much of the Christianity that has actually been preached and lived among people; they may teach us much of the way in which the gospel can be made a living faith; they may teach us that the deepest things of the gospel are not very consciously in people's minds at all. Is the meaning that Christianity has in the mind of the common man *religiously* adequate? If not, how can the task of the Church to communicate the gospel be effectively performed? This question seems to me vital to the maintenance of Christianity, and one that does need a real answer. I do not pretend to have the answer, but rather put the question before you: anything further I have to say is but commentary to express ways in which the problem comes home to me and not intended to distract attention from the main theme. Phillips Brooks in his *Lectures on Preaching* distinguishes between two interrelated aspects of the minister's work—"message" and "witness". "In these two words together", he says, "we have the fundamental conception of the matter of all Christian preaching". The idea of "witness" is certainly of fundamental importance. A religious message that is proclaimed from a detached position without having begun to influence the preacher's life carries no conviction; for though the preacher must proclaim that to which his life is no adequate witness, there must be some recognizable response for the message to be credible at all. And in every age "witness" has been demanded from Christians—they must as individuals and as groups show something of the spirit of their Lord. In the century

in which we live the demand for heroic Christian activity, concern that the ideal of life should not be a distant hazy dream but be translated into the concrete happenings of life, is not less urgent but more. The problems that are upon us—though they should not depress us, but rather wake us to their possibilities—the problems we cannot run away from are of the most serious nature. The call for devoted, consistent Christian living, that does not follow ancient ways blindly, but uses imagination and insight to consecrate new ways, cannot be too strongly stressed. But it can be stressed in the wrong way. Phillips Brooks coupled the "witness" with the "message". There are some people who are so anxious to "witness", so anxious, too, to make you understand that they are really witnessing, that they never give you a chance to hear about the "message" which is the cause of their witness in the first place, and is so infinitely more important than even the most valuable witness that they are privileged to do in service. If we are to meet some of the exacting demands that are made on us, we can only do it in the light of a great message, which can lift us up and give us power to conquer. People must know what is the message of Christianity if they are to be able to do Christian acts of service. We cannot stress the call of Christ as a task, a command, a problem, while people are muddled and bewildered about the meaning of life and their place in it and whether after all Christianity has anything definite to say on the nature of things.

A clear understanding of Christianity, be it understood, is not everything. There have been times when the doctrines taught by the Christian Church were clear and definite and all men knew them; not only those who were deeply concerned with religious things, nor even the average Christian, but the man in the street—whether sceptic or indifferent—had a real knowledge of what was meant by the Christian gospel. Not knowledge lit up by the light of personal experience and devotion but—as far as it went—a real knowledge. This was not, as I say, an ideal state of affairs, but then Christian leaders could stress as the thing of major importance the note of witness. People did not need to understand Christianity, they needed its message to transform the spirit of their lives. No religious teacher can fail to stress the urgency of responding with our heart and life; yet the state of affairs I have described should bring home to our minds the truth that the main content of a living religion ought to be inescapable in any community where it is actively practised, inescapable even by those who are quite indifferent. And I venture to think that it is a matter of very grave concern that non-Christians in this country have so meagre an understanding of Christianity. It is not enough to say that they are outside—and cannot be expected to understand. It would of course make a difference if they learned Christianity from inside—but Christianity is not being effectively proclaimed if they do not *know* in some sense what we stand for. And

the responsibility of getting itself understood would seem to rest with the Christian Church. There are times when the most pressing need for the maintenance of the spiritual life is not the stress on practical Christian life, but stress on the gospel of God's grace in the light of which we can live our life. When people are immersed in a strong and dominant religious tradition, insistence is necessary on the quickening of personal religion and the carrying of the influence of faith into matters of practical life. But where the religious tradition is confused, broken, or non-existent, while the insistence on practical expression cannot be lessened it is of the first importance to insist on the real content of Christian faith. One does not have to be a Barthian to see that there is point in Brunner's selecting, as the epitome of what he wants to attack, the phrase of Goethe's :

Gefühl ist alles
Name ist Schall und Rauch[1].

There comes a time when even the finest feelings—if they can never be harnessed to serve a definite meaning which can be known and understood—are a danger and not a help to life. And I believe that one aspect of the situation which we face to-day is the need to help people to understand the content of the Christian religion, whose moral teaching they are often anxious to see effectively realized in the lives of men and women.

And this concern is not less but rather more an insistence on the *practical* aspect of life. It is not a concern with matters of belief to the exclusion of the kind of life people actually live. For it is only when people are awake to the fullness of the love of God that they are free to devote all their energies to the practical interests of life. We may even go so far as to say that the only thing that matters in life are "problems". I mean by "problems" the possibilities of better living on the part of individuals and communities. But these can only be successfully tackled because of something which is not itself a "problem" at all. The laying hold of that which gives a meaning to all things in heaven and earth, or rather the being laid hold of by God in the fulfilment of His purpose, gives an outlook of vital importance for the living of our life in peace and quietness. We must put our best foot forward, just because of what we know of God; but we work in quietness knowing that the meaning of our life does not depend on the accomplishment or non-accomplishment of what is of such urgent interest for us, but on what God is, and what He has done for us.

For this reason I cannot believe that the main thing to be stressed to-day in the preaching of the Gospel is *freedom*. If by freedom you mean freedom to achieve the deepest desires of our own hearts, to live "in holiness and righteousness before him all the days of our

1 Feeling is everything : name is sound and smoke.

life", freedom to serve God and our fellow men, freedom to be Christlike—then I agree utterly. That freedom is the goal we all desire. But people may differ radically on what it is that will produce that kind of freedom. And what we need to stress is the thing that will bring about this positive kind of freedom. For it does not depend on *getting rid* of anything, but on bringing something in. I would also agree that in various ways legitimate freedom, *i.e.*, absence of restraint, is imperilled in the modern world, and that the cause of freedom needs the strong support of Christians. I am thinking particularly here of the political sphere, though I recognize that the question of what true economic and social freedom really is is one that calls for careful consideration. I would only say that legitimate freedom should be recognized in every sphere: there are those who protest against the *Gleichschaltung* of Christianity in a modern State, but are ready to admit only so much of Christianity as may be allowed by modern science, which is equally a blow to freedom.

The thing I find incredible is the supposition that what needs stressing to-day is: freedom in the sense of escape from the bonds of a cramping religious tradition. The vast majority of people under about thirty-five have not known it, especially in the contacts and experiences which have exercised most influence over them; they have only known a fragmentary and confused tradition, and their struggle has been and is to find some solid ground on which to stand. There is no need to urge people to be free: the need is to reveal some trustworthy tradition to live by. I am not denying the influence of tradition. No one can escape it. But the condition of sound healthy progress is a consistent tradition which allows for constant criticism. It is one thing to demand freedom to criticize the tradition in which you live; it is another thing to be free to criticize anything, but to be hampered continually by the lack of a real tradition commanding respect even in disagreement. The generation that is under thirty-five has only learned the meaning of Christianity in a confused and partial way; there are gaps in its knowledge the filling of which would resolve much turmoil and disturbance of mind; what it needs is not freedom but the laying hold of a faith which stamps the whole of life, which does not leave the individual to his own resources, but puts at his disposal the wisdom of the Church. What people need is not freedom but a new sense of the positive content of Christianity, an awareness that from Christianity we learn that which cannot be derived from anywhere else, that it is from Christianity that we derive the strength of our outlook on life and our acting in accordance with that outlook.

For that reason I am disturbed to think that the meaning of Christianity for the common man is vague and uncertain. The factors that have brought about this uncertainty have been productive of much good, and I have no desire to go back on it. We cannot

return to a view of Christianity which, though it may have been certain, offends our minds and consciences. The change, for instance, in the climate of religious opinion in regard to Hell, a change which older people remember occurring in their lifetime, though it may have gone too far, is not one that people really desire to see reversed. Again the factor which is one of the greatest revolutions in the history of Christianity—the application of scientific criticism to the books of the Bible—is one that it is not only undesirable but impossible to reverse. We cannot go back. But it is possible to ask whether Christianity now has sufficient content to continue as a religious power in the life of the world, shaping the lives of men and women and communities, and if so whether the common man lays hold of it adequately.

The religious content of Christianity would seem to involve a belief about God, about the world as the sphere of the accomplishment of God's purpose, and about human nature and its destiny. And the apprehension of this religious content seems to need a language in which people may express themselves, and means of sustaining personal religion. In other days the religious content and implications of Christianity might be taken for granted, and stress be laid on its meaning for practical life. So the philosopher Kant, though he revolted in part from the Christian tradition in which he had been brought up, took God, freedom, and immortality for granted. But to-day we may ask whether people do sufficiently realize that Christianity is a religion, and is fundamentally a belief in God—the Supreme Reality with whom we have to do. We are not concerned here with abstract puzzles but with questions of the highest religious importance. It makes all the difference in the world what the character of God is, how we should think of the world and the nature and destiny of human lives. The value of Christianity does not lie in a vague and uncertain affirmation on these matters, but in a special and distinct affirmation which is its strength. And it makes all the difference whether Christianity is true or false. But do people to-day lay hold of the religious content of Christianity or are they content with a sincere aspiration, related somewhat uncertainly to beliefs associated with Christianity? Or am I wrong in thinking that Christianity must have a positive content? If it has not I cannot think that it will remain as a shaping force in the life of the world. (The situation, of course, reflects the uncertainty in the mind of religious leaders for some time past. It indicates to my mind not that all teaching has been ineffective but that the kind of teaching, which while awake to desirable and necessary changes, maintained the religious witness, has not been prevalent and effective. The situation, I fully recognize, might be a great deal worse; I am only trying to estimate what things are like and what can be done about it.)

Some distinguished Christian leaders appear to me to sidestep the issue I have raised by stressing as the one important thing either faith in Jesus Christ or devotion to the person of Jesus Christ. I am not wanting to deny the supreme importance of this emphasis; and I am prepared heartily to agree that it may be all important and all inclusive. It may mean moving out of the realm of merely strenuous endeavour to the realm of religious life through faith and trust in One in whom God has revealed His very self and whose influence over the world which He has redeemed fails not but increases—but it may mean very much less than this. It may leave people essentially vague as to the nature of God and human destiny. It is essentially ambiguous, and it is precisely over the question of the meaning of "faith in Jesus Christ" and "devotion to the person of Jesus Christ" that people are at issue to-day. The people who stress the central importance of faith in Jesus Christ usually have a much deeper religious background than those they are addressing, and take for granted things their hearers do not. Where there is a strong religious tradition, the simplest statement may convey much that never comes to explicit statement. But we are living in days when we cannot take for granted religious tradition; when we cannot assume that people know their Bibles but can introduce them for the first time to many parts of it; when we must make explicit what Christianity really means. We cannot assume that what is taken for granted by uneducated Christian teachers enters into the mind of the ordinary Christian. That is why, though I too would stress faith in Jesus Christ as central and all important, I am anxious that it should convey the full truth of the Gospel of the love of God declared in His Son, and set people free for the things they can accomplish and suffer and be in His service, and that it should not leave them still vague and uncertain where their lives should be strengthened by Christian beliefs.

The Christian Church is tested and judged by the kind of life people lead who call themselves by the Christian name. I do not in the least want to lessen the importance or application of that test, which has the highest authority, "By their fruits ye shall know them". But even our best efforts come short of the glory of God. The Church is also tested by the extent to which the common man is made aware of the religious meaning of Christianity in which he shall find life and peace.

So I ask: Has the common man an adequate understanding of Christianity? If not, what can be done about it?

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS.

This section of our Journal aims at chronicling not only developments in theological thought and in ecclesiastical organization, but also practical experiments in all branches of religious life and service.

Often when successful attempts have been made to solve some problem in one part of the country, the rest of the Churches remain ignorant, and we trust that these pages will not only serve as a clearing-house of ideas and a record of changing emphasis, but also broadcast valuable information of progress in Church and denominational life.

Our representatives in the Colonies and the United States will from time to time contribute accounts of similar movements. The Editor will be glad to consider brief articles serving this purpose.

A WORLD PREACHING MISSION

By the Rev. C. Jeffares McCombe, D.D.

When the fullness of time was come God sent forth His ambassadors in a National Preaching Mission to the people of the United States of America. He did this at a moment when the moral and spiritual life of the nation had sunken to a discouragingly low level. Two years thereafter, in retrospect, responsible citizens in all areas of life and action are agreed that the united message of the Christian Church changed the mind of America. The Mission created a new climate. It was so markedly successful as to convince the most conservative and cautious that it was under the guidance of God.

The Mission was launched at a time when men were disillusioned by the nostrums that had been tried and sceptical concerning the panaceas proposed. Futhermore, it had the advantage of being nation wide in its scope. Previous spiritual awakenings had geographical limitations. This was indeed and in truth *national*. The interest and response was as keen on the Pacific coast as it was along the Atlantic seaboard and in the Middle West. Rather remarkable when you consider a three months' crusade across such a vast territory inhabited by such a variety of peoples.

The Mission was sponsored and promoted by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America through its department of Evangelism. A select representative Committee was commissioned to carry forward the Mission in twenty-eight strategically located cities. Eighty missioners were carefully and prayerfully chosen, receiving no remuneration for this work other than their regular salary from the institutions they served. They were graciously and generously released to give from one to two months to the Mission. Approximately fifteen Missioners were responsible for each Mission, which

lasted four days. They were chosen on the basis of their acknowledged evangelical emphasis, together with their special preparation for the presentation of a distinctive phase of the Christian message. That is to say, we sought to reach the total life of the community through Mass Meetings, Seminars, Labour Unions, Luncheon Clubs, Schools, Universities, and Street Meetings, by those who were capable of expounding the truth as it is in Jesus in terms understandable by the groups addressed.

We would studiously avoid worshipping the god of statistics at the altar of numbers. Yet some figures will assist us in formulating an idea of the magnitude of the movement.

The eighty Missioners met 2,912 appointments, an average of 104 in each city, speaking two to five times daily within a radius of 75 miles from the Mission City. Three-hundred-and-fifty cities were visited in extension meetings. A Mass Meeting in Philadelphia was attended by 20,000; Madison Square Gardens in New York had 19,000 admitted by ticket. In a city of 20,000 over 8,000 were present at a single meeting. Twenty-five thousand ministers were present at meetings specially arranged for them. A total of 1,275,955 were actually in attendance, while countless millions were in the invisible radio audience.

Two years have been added to history since this notable united Christian achievement registered itself in such a marked manner on the mind of the Church and the nation. That which gives us cause to rejoice as we indulge in retrospect is the glorious fact that we are moved to do it again. The Churches that comprise the Federal Council have all with one consent through this central functioning body authorized another National Preaching Mission. No greater or more conclusive assurance can be given as to the satisfactory effectiveness of the previous Mission than that another of the same is desired.

Whether or not it will be identical with the previous one is yet to be determined. Inasmuch as the keenest minds of the Christian Church in America were heavily involved either as Missioners or local participants their counsel will be eagerly sought and their suggestions will receive the most searching consideration by the Committee which is now being formed for the purpose of promoting the new Mission.

Moreover, it was increasingly evident that one of the most fruitful phases of the Mission was the period of preparation. During the months that intervened between the selection of the cities as Mission centres and the date of the Mission the ministers and churches gave themselves to prayer and preparation. The high expectancy which was everywhere present was an enormous contributing factor. Not otherwise could so much have been accomplished in such a brief Mission period. It is for that reason we have fixed the date for the

second National Mission two years in advance. It is proposed that we give ourselves to the creating of a national Christian-mindedness—a God-consciousness—as we approach October, 1940, at which time we join our forces and pool our resources in going to the nation with the glorious Gospel of the Kingdom of God.

Some of us have been deeply moved by what we believe to be a God-given vision. It seems to be especially clear to those whose habit it is to visit Britain and the Continent with some degree of regularity in summer preaching. A vision which, if it became a reality, would have profound and determining effect far beyond our wildest imaginings. Supposing we ignore national and denominational barriers. Supposing we cease theorizing about Christian unity. Supposing we forget some puttering parish details. Supposing we discontinue analysing current events. Supposing we rise above all petty differences and, standing shoulder to shoulder, we present a united front to a disunited world!

I make bold to suggest that we seriously consider the wisdom of jointly undertaking a *World Preaching Mission*. I use the title to suggest the idea, without in any way indicating that it should be adhered to. Oxford, Edinburgh, and Utrecht have proved to us that we are sufficiently agreed on the essentials of the Christian message. Agreement on the balance will come more rapidly when we proceed to proclaim what we know. Surely it is as applicable to the community of believers as to the individual that, "If any man willeth to do His will he shall know". We must use what we have before we are entrusted with more. Therefore I cannot conceive of anything that would give greater momentum to the unity of believers than that of going to the world with what we know and believe and experience as children of God.

The World Council of Churches is fast becoming a reality. Yet those of us who are most enthusiastic about this supreme achievement in modern Christian history bemoan the fact that it will require much time for it to become real in the experience of the individual churchman. Who among us could suggest anything that would hasten the concept of a united Christendom more than the demonstration of it in Christendom uniting in a World Preaching Mission?

Of much greater significance than the unity of the Church is the purpose for which the Church unites, namely, "that the world might believe". For many centuries, and more particularly during the past generation, we have harked back to this golden ideal. Yet the progress toward its being made real has been painfully and pathetically slow. Has the hour arrived in which we can indeed and in truth demonstrate to the world that we are one? Behind guarded doors in our conferences we discovered "a unity deeper than our divisions". Why keep it secret? Why not manifest to the world that deeper

unity? Why not accept the royal commission and actually go into all the world in that deeper unity and preach! Why not?

Such an adventure in righteousness should be interdenominational. The minor issues on which we differ will not suffer from neglect while we go to the nation and the world (which is rapidly becoming a lunatic asylum) with the major matters. It is not optional. Unless we go immediately, unitedly, and with desperate urgency, will there be any civilization left worth saving? Will there be any Christian Church left to save it?

More than that, the World Preaching Mission will give enormous impetus to the Kingdom of God, not alone because of the simultaneity of the undertaking but because of its being world-wide in scope. An International Interchange of Missioners during the period of the Mission would create the will to peace. The green-eyed monsters of jealousy and suspicion are peering through the windows of the capital buildings of the nations, when we are discovering that the penalty of being suspicious is that we see what we suspect. At such an hour the challenge to the Church is to send her ambassadors of God across her international frontiers with the sole ambition to herald the good news of the Gospel of our Blessed Lord which most certainly will emphasize the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of Man. Such a crusade might not save our civilization, but if *it* fails nothing else will succeed. It is the deepest conviction of my life that the hour is opportune. Mankind has turned to every imaginable device. He has exhausted every idea. He is now in the process of building a war machine with which to commit suicide. That fatal moment—at this writing—has not yet arrived. I hasten to have my say. We have been told that Christianity has not yet been tried, or if tried it has been found difficult and therefore not pursued. It must be tried and applied immediately. The world is not yet convinced that we are sufficiently serious to make the necessary sacrifice to save it. They have a sneaking surmise that we are only interested in saving our own souls. With all my life I hope that there is yet time and the possibility and probability of stirring the imagination, capturing the attention, and diverting the secular and militaristic mind from the things that are seen and temporal to the things that are unseen and eternal by the sheer daring of a simultaneous World Preaching Mission.

PEACE IN OUR TIME.

By H. R. Chillingworth, M.A.

The phrase is perhaps significant of its maker's hopes; he did not expect much. After his time war would no doubt break out once more, but, with the help of Heaven, he and his generation might go to their graves in peace. Throughout a great part of the historical period even this hope would have taxed faith. The recurrence of war was accepted unquestioningly. "At the time when Kings go forth to battle", was evidently intended to be as indicative of a seasonal recurrence as the almanac phrase, "Grouse shooting begins". In seven hundred years, it is said, the temple of Janus was shut only three times.

Even now, the wish for lasting peace is much stronger than belief in its possibility. "War will die out late", said Tennyson, as he thought of a world rapidly filling up and of harvests too small for its inhabitants; and our experience of the years since the second *Locksley Hall* was written does not seem to warrant a stronger faith in lasting peace than Tennyson's. War, we think, may be staved off for a generation, perhaps for a longer period—the practical question is, by what means?

One answer is tacitly given in the present frantic re-armament of the world. Nations, by arming, hope to become so formidable that rivals will fear to attack. A nation with a grievance—one of the have-not nations—may arm for the purpose of attacking, of getting by means of war something that seems unobtainable by peaceful means; but all nations stoutly maintain that it is to preserve peace that they are increasing their strength. What good, they say, would they be as allies to a hard-pressed neighbour, if they were unarmed? They seek no quarrel, but, being in, they are resolved that the opposed shall have reason to beware of them. And, in fact, peace can be preserved by such means—for a time. But only for a time. No nation can go on indefinitely increasing its armament. *Propter vitam vivendi perdere causas* is folly. Will the rival nations then be forced to pick a quarrel, and so, by one mighty effort, rid themselves of an intolerable burden; or will they be able, as it were, to mark time, preserving peace without increasing armaments? If the latter course is open to them, it is evident that taking it stultifies their previous action; if heavily armed nations can live at peace with one another, lightly armed or unarmed nations can surely do so with better prospects of success and at an expense incomparably smaller. In reality, their chances of living at peace while heavily armed are very slight. With so much powder lying about, the likelihood of an explosion is increased enormously, and there will always be young fools (and old fools too) willing to take the risk of an explosion for the sake of the excitement and possible loot. One has, however, to

remember that, under modern conditions of warfare, the chances of enjoying the excitement which a *frischer fröhlicher Krieg* provides are not what they used to be: one's chances of survival as a combatant have become greatly reduced, and as a non-combatant one is faced with the unattractive prospect of being wiped out ingloriously in an air-raid. It is this prospect, combined with the knowledge that the issue of a modern war is likely to be decided in favour of the side which gets in the first blow, that is probably our present strongest preservative of peace. It is curious but, I think, true that militarism carried to an extreme, or near one, should have a result not unlike that of its opposite, pacifism.

Pacifism, the alternative to re-armament, has in recent years almost become practical politics. It is a heroic remedy, but, for that very reason, a possible remedy. It has the power of attracting the young and the high-spirited as well as the merely thoughtful. Militarism, pacifists see, cannot give a lasting peace, except at the price of a shattered civilization. On the other hand, as it takes two to make a quarrel, they believe that a pacifist nation, being unable by its principles to become a menace to its neighbours, cannot excite their hostility. Hatred is, nine times out of ten, due to fear; where fear is absent, hatred is not likely to be found. Sometimes, however, hatred is due to thwarted greed, and when it has this origin, the pacifist's consistency is much more severely tested. Could a pacifist Abyssinia have escaped the fangs of the Roman wolf? How is a pacifist to deal with a robber? No prescription can be given; the treatment must be left to the patient's discretion. To his discretion? No, to himself. He may succeed in keeping his purse; but, if he does, he will be as unable as you or anyone to explain how. The greatest of pacifists could not have explained how He passed unscathed through the mob of fanatical Nazarenes who had led Him "to the brow of the hill whereon their city was built, that they might cast him down headlong". There is no good reason for doubting the truth of the story; George Fox and John Wesley got safely out of equally dangerous surroundings. They had no arm of flesh to protect them, but nevertheless they opposed force to force. Pity did not save them; they won because they were stronger than their enemies. No idealistic weakling need expect to overcome a bully. To do so, an idealist must be strong; he must be a whole man, *ein ganzer Mann*, as the Germans say. Christians are forbidden to resist evil, but they are told, with equal emphasis, to be perfect[1].

Not many of us are perfect, or have even the characteristic common to all who unarmed have overawed their enemies—perfect courage. There are weak places in our spiritual armour, and our consciousness of defects weakens our whole defence. And our enemies

[1] It is worth noticing that even Jesus seems to have lost the power of overawing His enemies after the "cleansing of the Temple"—after His use of physical force.

are not slow in discovering our state of mind and in taking advantage of it. Pacifism will not save us. Pacifism alone can save neither individual nor nation. The right to rely on it must be earned by self-discipline. The right is earned by few individuals, and it is doubtful whether it can ever be earned by a nation. Can one imagine any nation so coherent that the resolution of its leaders to endure persecution rather than retaliate will be accepted and acted on by all its citizens? If passive resistance became universal, then, I dare say, the enemy would be foiled. He would get as little satisfaction from his military operations as a boxer would get from striking a punching-ball that hung loose. But, would passive resistance ever become universal? And, if it became universal, would it last? Would the high-spirited youth of the nation endure the insolence of an invader? Would statesmen see without protest their work and the work of their predecessors undone? Would a country of liberal institutions see its government degraded to a despotism without striking a blow for its ancient liberties? The self-control necessary for such patience would be amazing in an individual; in a nation it would be miraculous. And how long, in any case, would the miracle last? Some sections of the population would surely break away: fellows of the baser sort would make terms with the invader; others would resist; the united front would be broken; and the enemy would triumph once more.

I do not say that such miraculous self-control is impossible, even for a nation. One can conceive of a whole people filled with an invincible enthusiasm for peace and good fellowship, breaking down the walls of prejudice and suspicion that separate nation from nation, and infecting neighbouring peoples, even rivals, with a similar enthusiasm. One has no right to declare miracles impossible for a people filled with true religion—not mere adherents of some theological system effective for good only within narrow limits and either ineffective or productive of harm beyond them, but adherents of a religion which in essence is love, that power "that moves the sun in Heaven and all the stars". The Group movement has already done good work in smoothing out differences between political parties; have we any right to set bounds to its influence?

But, as things are, we seem unable to get beyond a compromise—putting our trust in God while keeping our powder dry. Even such a compromise is hard to maintain; it is so easy to neglect the imponderables while attending to material defence. Yet it is the imponderables—truthfulness, sympathy, the desire to do justice—which, in the long run, will give the world peace, not only in our time, but always.

The imponderables need not be neglected. If it is unreasonable to expect a people to become and remain wholly pacifist, it seems just as unreasonable to expect a people ever to be wholly militarist. Even

the individual, the microcosm, has moods; even the militarist makes plans for peace. He sees peace at the end of a war which has given his country security or such an addition to its territory as satisfies the national vanity—or aspirations, as he calls it. He does not live for war. The pacifist differs from him in desiring a peace won without loss to his neighbour, and in believing that such a peace can be won without war or preparation for war. Most people in democratic countries, however, seem to differ both from the militarist and the pacifist: from the militarist, in rejecting offensive war as criminal madness and in regarding defensive war as at best a horrible necessity; from the pacifist in believing that this horrible thing must be prepared for. I cannot see that the belief of the majority is unwarranted. But I do see that it will be quite as futile as the belief of the militarist or of the pacifist, if our peace preparations do not steadily diminish the importance of our military defence. As our peace preparations increase, our preparations for war must decrease. If our war preparations do not decrease, we must see what is wrong with our peace plans. After all, we are novices; we have still to learn most of the technique of peace-making and peace-keeping.

ON LIFE AND BOOKS.

WHEN CONGREGATIONALISTS SHARE
OVERHEARD AT A GROUP MEETING

[In fear and trembling, but with a strong undertone of belief in the sense of humour of Congregationalists, we print this *jeu d'esprit*. To save space quotations have been omitted. A key has been placed in our hands. All the speakers are well-known Congregationalists and should be easily identified. A copy of *Thirty-five to Fifty* will be sent to the first reader from whom the most correct list is received by the Editor, 35 Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4, before October 9th.—EDITOR.]

The Minor Prophet en route to Nineveh: In the tragic tensions of our time the supreme need is authority. We must go back to Geneva. Only in the great dogmas of the faith can salvation be found. *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus.*

The Inspired Mouse: Put it so that the servant girl in the gallery can understand it.

The Blackheathen: The fear of reason is greatly to be deplored. The question must be treated scientifically. As Cagliostro has written (quotation omitted). This is confirmed by Copernkepleo in his *Weltanschauung* (quotation again omitted).

Ocili: This is not heresy, it is unbelief. Did not St. Thomas Aquinas say in the *British Weekly* [Latin quotation omitted]?

Sandy: Umph! Is that Independency?

Minus Accent: I faced this question when I was a student. On the one hand is this position, on the other that. I and Ritschl are in the middle. This can be seen in

I (a)
(b)
(c)
II (i)
(ii)
(iii)

Voice from Adullam: Let me illustrate from my missionary experience.

With Coat so gay: There is a misprint on p. 58. Besides which Congregationalism is inevitable.

O'Reilly: Mr. Chairman, I have given notice of the following amendment (six pages of amendment omitted) to be sent to the Pope, the Prime Minister, the Editor of the *Congregational Quarterly*, and the Rajah of Sarawak.

The Glowing Orb: This is the only thing of which I have not been Chairman.

Constant Reader of the "Christian World": The whole problem is that of settlements and removals. I have been in communication with the Moderators for 999 years, and have not had a single introduction to a church yet.

Gwilyhughlinc: It is impossible for us to describe in public the matters with which we have to deal.

Tom: On this point, Mr. Chairman, I want to say three things.

Dick: Workers of the world, unite!

Harry: What we need is a liturgy.

Polly: Let's have another Commission.

From the Peace Front: Tertullianus held and is supported by Origenes, that no one should be spanked, not even Roman Catholics or the divulger of this conversation.

J. C.

[And yet we are a happy family, and remain in the main stream of the Evangelical Faith!—EDITOR.]

WORTH NOTING FROM RECENT BOOKS.

INDEED, is not the Bible itself one long story of God's escape from man's attempt to imprison Him? In his anxiety for security man tried to bind God's presence in many ways, and not least of all by making sure that he observed punctilously God's own institutions. But God broke away every time.

He broke away from the Jews who tried to imprison Him in His temple. He broke away from them again when they tried to bind Him to His choice of Abraham's seed. He broke away still again when they attempted to limit Him to His own sign of circumcision. He broke away from the twelve disciples when they tried to restrict Him to their band and forbade another man to cast out devils in His name. He broke away again when His Jewish followers attempted to circumscribe the foundation of His Church by basing it upon Jewry. And long after the New Testament period He was still engaged in this flight from man's imprisoning hands.

We find Him running away from the shelter of the Vatican in Martin Luther, bursting the bonds of priests and bishops in George Fox, breaking the chain of apostolic succession in John Wesley, shattering the fetters of the sacraments in William Booth; and so right on to our day remaining the God whom no man can secure.

D. T. NILES, *Sir, We Would See Jesus.*

"How long would you say it takes to make a convert, Father?" asked Jim. He likes things cut and dried.

"Oh, I should say about five generations," smiled Father Dunn. "One generation while the first hatred wears off. Then a second while they begin to think we might be human, like themselves; during that time they begin to accept what we have to give them in the way of services and schools. Then a third while they begin to think our religion's not so bad, either. Then a fourth, while it dawns on them it is, in fact, better than theirs. And, then, hey presto, in the fifth—the trick's done."

. . .

"There are missionaries in these parts", I said, "who think that five generations is time enough to redeem a soul from Islam. Do you, too, think that time enough? Or too much?"

"And what did the Lord say unto Satan?", the reply was, the eye going dark, the mouth grim. " 'Is not this a brand plucked from the fire?' And what will remain of a brand, brother, if you leave it in the fire for five generations?"

LOUIS GOLDING, *In The Steps of Moses the Conqueror.*

Sacraments are not externals tacked on to a Christianity which is really complete and adequate without them. They are integral to it; and they are so, we can now see clearly, because they re-dramatize for men in every age the central facts of the Gospel; they re-enact the mighty acts of God, which though wrought once for all are yet concrete embodiments of eternal truth.

JAMES GRAY, in *The Christian Quarterly.*

There within the bald walls of an old humble country church with simplest forms and our Lord's words unadorned, this man, accustomed to the swelling ceremony of the Mass found the likest thing to the original institution in the upper room.

The contrast there between the simple Scottish rite and the Romish and other elaborations suggests the contrast there is between the paucity of reference there is to the Lord's Supper in Scripture and the exaggerated importance that is attached to it in many quarters today.

But to judge from the New Testament it was never meant by our Lord or by His Apostles that the observance of the Lord's Supper should take precedence of the preaching of the Gospel. If that has been intended, why are the references to it in the New Testament so scanty? We are told of its institution in the synoptics. Paul does the same in *1 Cor.* 11 and refers to it also in *1 Cor.* 10, but nowhere else in his writings. It may be indicated in *Acts* by the phrase "the breaking of bread". Its observance seems to be implied in the words "supper being ended" in *John* 13^2. But that exhausts the references. It is not mentioned by James, Peter, or the author of *Hebrews*. No reference is made to it in the *Acts* in connection with the founding of the churches, nor in the Pastoral Epistles, among the duties of office-bearers. How is this scantiness of reference to be accounted for, if its observance is of paramount importance in the life and worship of the Church? Is not the truth indicated in what Paul says in *1 Cor.* about the other rite, about Baptism: "Christ sent me not to baptise but to preach the gospel". What he felt was true of the one rite was equally true of the other. Valuable as rites are, appointed by Christ Himself, of rare helpfulness to the faith and life of the believer, their place is still secondary. The pity is that the Church of Christ has ignored this; and the simple rites in their studied simplicity as instituted by our Lord have been embellished and magnified out of all proportion and have become bones of contention and division in place of bonds of fellowship and brotherly love.

R. J. Drummond, in *The Evangelical Quarterly.*

If armchair critics of public libraries and the work they are doing, and the increase in that work they are attempting, would leave their armchairs and spend a day or two in the long rows of houses in the new housing estates, or in the scattered rural areas of the English and Scottish counties, and see for themselves the necessity for bringing knowledge to fortify life, they would perhaps be less critical than they are. If they could know more of the many children of poor homes who have passed from Reference Library study to scholarship and then through the benefits of fuller education to lives of character and influence; if they could come to appreciate the brightening influence of reading on drab lives; if they could see the effect of contact between good books and the minds, the very fertile minds, of children; if they knew what books had been to, and made of, many a man in the slough of despair through unemployment which was no fault of his own, they would be less critical. If they could feel, in short, even a small measure of the idealism a librarian must feel if he is to do his job properly, they would be less critical.

Duncan Gray, *Public Library Finance.*

We are now in a position to affirm that Christianity is not a set of doctrines or a Church organization; these are merely forms of its own self-expression. Christianity is the revelation that human life is personal, and, since the awareness of this truth is the incentive to human development, it may be described further as the key which looses the dynamic energy within man to achieve community. Christianity is the force in history working to this end: it is a force rather than a creed.

Kenneth Ingram, *The Christian Challenge to Christians.*

THE CONGREGATIONAL THEOLOGICAL CONFERENCE, 1938.

This year's Theological Conference met at Cambridge from July 4th to 7th to consider "The Christian Doctrine of Sin and Salvation". It was a Conference which quickly came to grips with its subject; the papers had been carefully planned to give a progression in thought, and each succeeded in stimulating ready and fruitful discussion. We began by trying to discover what sin essentially is; we then turned receptively to find out what psychology has to tell us concerning the sinner; next we sought to assess the forms which sin assumes when it manifests itself in the sphere of conduct; and finally we endeavoured to see what is meant by punishment, repentance, and forgiveness, and what is implied in the Christian experience of reconciliation with God.

The first paper, read by the Rev. John Marsh, bore the title "The Fundamental Nature of Sin". Mr. Marsh insisted that "sin" is distinctively a term of the Christian religion. If we want to know what it means we must go to the Scriptures for our knowledge and learn what is revealed there concerning our human condition. This thesis he defended in a careful and discriminating study of the Biblical doctrine of sin.

Israel's religion, as it is described in the Old Testament, is the religion of a covenant: the people pledged themselves to God's service, and God undertook to be their God. The fact of sin and the problems of its nature arise from Israel's repeated failure to keep the covenant. Sometimes it was broken by high-handed and rebellious action, such as apostasy; sometimes the transgression was unwitting and involuntary. It is this unwitting sin which creates the real problem. How does it come about that, without any desire to rebel against God or transgress His Law, man still does it? We all do it, and surely a universal experience like this leads us to ask questions, not only about our deeds, but about ourselves.

Mr. Marsh then reviewed the answers made by the Jewish theologians who, working exegetically upon their Scriptures, addressed themselves to this great question. He showed us that the two types of theory offered—the Rabbinical view of the "evil imagination", and the more popular eschatological conceptions of the Fall—alike carried their diagnosis to the point that man is apart from God, and that to this condition of his nature are due his weakness, his malady, and his death. Man cannot deliver himself from this desperate plight: he can only wait for a deliverance wrought by God. In Jewish thought this deliverance was regarded either as the divinely appointed Law, or as an intervention of God which would take place in the future.

The New Testament opens with a proclamation addressed to men in this evil case. Jesus announces that God, and not sin, is reigning. He knows that He is the conqueror of sin, and the inaugurator of the new kingdom of hope and promise which men may enter through God's grace. In Him a new covenant is given. God's kingdom is an eschatological reality; it may be a reality here and now for those who will receive it in Him, even though it has not yet come in the life of the world. That the situation has been so changed by the advent of Jesus is the message of the New Testament writers. John insists that judgment has come with Jesus. Men must answer Him; He creates division by demanding decision. Paul reiterates that Christ does what the Law was appointed to do, but failed to do. He meets us in our reality as sinners, but meets us as the

Redeemer who lifts us out of the world of sin and death into true righteousness and eternal life. So, "in principle the Christian is free from sin, delivered from its bondage, dead to it. That is God's gift in Christ. But empirically the fight with death and sin goes on. In our body, *i.e.*, as human, as mortal, we are still given to death and sin. But in our spirit we are alive unto God for evermore. Here lies the possibility and the explanation of the eschatological kingdom of God".

The Rev. E. R. Micklem laid us all under obligation by his study of what the psychologist may properly contribute to our understanding of sin. Speaking on "The Psychological Interpretation of Sin", he showed us that it is not within the province of psychology either to propound definitions of sin or to criticize them. But it may tell us about sinning and its relation to the human personality. Acknowledgment was made of the useful service done by analytical psychologists in their demonstration that at the back of all human behaviour are innate impulses, which are themselves non-rational and morally neutral, but whose adequate expression is necessary for a balanced and integrated personality. The concept of the "Unconscious" was then examined and we were shown that one of its activities, namely "repression", frequently plays a part in the genesis of moral diseases. Mr. Micklem suggested that the psychologist may legitimately draw a distinction between "moral diseases", which result from repressed complexes, and "sins", which are the consequence of deliberate and consciously willed choices. But this distinction cannot satisfy the theologian in his endeavour to interpret Christian experience and find out the real nature of sin. We can think of a man committing a misdemeanour as the result of a "moral disease", who yet, because he is deeply religious, knows that his conduct is wrong, and feels himself to be a sinner and not fully reconciled to God.

This led Mr. Micklem to discuss the feeling of guilt. Psychology speaks truly when it says that the intensity with which a man feels guilty is not necessarily a true indication of the actual guilt he has incurred. Indeed, a sense of guilt may be self-induced to meet the demand of a theological presupposition like a "conviction of sin". We recognize too, that the feeling of guilt which accompanies a repression is frequently morbid, and may be projected on to actions which are in themselves entirely innocent. (Though behind the repression there may well be a failure somewhere to be honest and sincere with life.) But we may not admit the claim that a continued feeling of guilt is always pathological, nor do we accept the indictment frequently made of evangelical Christianity from this assumption. It is possible for a man to be sensitive to the demands of righteousness without having a morbid sense of guilt. The Cross does that for him: it convicts and saves at the same time. It stabs his spirit awake to sin and real guilt, and at the same time assures him of God's love and sets him free for God's service.

"The Ethical Interpretation of Sin" was the subject allotted to Dr. R. S. Franks. Again there was agreement that sin properly belongs to the domain of religion. But since Christianity is an ethical religion through and through, "there is no religious relation to God in Christianity which is independent of, and outside of, ethics". In ethics the fundamental concept is obligation and this exists only where there is freedom. The ethical consideration of sin is therefore limited to actions of which a man is aware and which are done against a known obligation. It is not concerned with a guilt that is ceremonial or merely legal. And from the standpoint of ethics sin is properly attached only to an individual.

A review of the various forms which sin may take—the moral failure of "missing the mark"; moral weakness; ignorance, selfishness; the deeper and more deliberate form of selfishness we call self-centredness; self-deception; and evil imagination—led Dr. Franks to describe in searching words the moral deterioration which takes place in a personality when it is invaded by sin. Once given an entry and a welcome we find sin gaining more and more power over a life until the man comes to cherish evil in his purposes and desires. At length the whole personality becomes "consecrated with an evil consecration to the service of sin", and it is then that sin becomes "exceeding sinful".

The next part of the paper was concerned with the problem of compromise and its limits; we discussed the question of choosing the lesser of two evils. It was suggested that a limitation of the law to love all men is put upon us by the necessity we are under of living with our fellows in the various "orders" of human society. There is something analogous to this situation in the activity of God, Who, for the general good of humanity, may appear to limit His love for this or that man in the operation of natural law. Dr. Franks emphasized, however, that in our salvation God acts freely out of a pure love which enters into communion with each individual.

Dr. A. T. Cadoux, who made a welcome return to the Conference after several years' absence, led our thought through the questions raised by "Punishment, Repentance, and Forgiveness". He found it difficult to regard God as directly active in the punishment of sin. But the consequences which follow upon wrong-doing come by His permission and are effective in His universe, and may therefore be expected to contribute something to our understanding of Him. Two such consequences were discussed—the pains which attend evil-doing, and the rupture of fellowship with God which sin inevitably produces. The pains (like the pains which follow ignorance, accident, or certain acts of altruism) come in accordance with the laws of nature, and are only indirectly an expression of God's will. But they indicate that God seeks in His universe something higher than ease, and we must think of Him as Himself feeling the pain He allows, as part of the inevitable cost of what He desires. So too, the cessation of fellowship with God is in a secondary sense an expression of His will. If the fellowship did not cease, God would become a partner in a conspiracy of selfishness. "If we could have fellowship with God while we were breaking fellowship with our fellows, God's fellowship would be a factor in, and the confirmation of, evil". But in these results which evil brings upon the wrongdoer, God finds not satisfaction, but sorrow, and when the sinner accepts them as the mark of God's disapproval of his acts, he has already found a measure of fellowship with God, and that is not punishment, but pardon.

Having interpreted repentance as a thorough and inward change of the self which implies a readiness to reorganize life upon a completely new principle, Dr. Cadoux proceeded to give us a careful and deep analysis of the human experience of giving and receiving forgiveness. He showed that one who loves a sinner is often more deeply pained by his wrongdoing than the person whom he injures. In such a way does God feel sorrow at the sins we commit. This fact, incredible and inconceivable though it be in itself, is brought home to us by Jesus and His Cross. This is the sense of sin which brings us to repentance, thereby making it possible for us to receive forgiveness and be restored to joyous and creative fellowship with God.

The concluding paper, on "Salvation and the Work of Christ", was read by Dr. Vincent Taylor, of Wesley College, Leeds. It was a delight and a privilege to welcome him to the Conference, and he gave us richly from the great stores of his mind. He began by examining the historic conceptions of the work of the Saviour which have emerged within Christianity. This he did in such a way as to make us feel the positive contributions to Christian thought which have been made by the various types of theory. Turning then to the testimony of Christian experience, he sought to show us that in the term "Reconciliation" we have a concept which includes all that we mean by forgiveness and redemption and at the same time emphasizes a personal relationship with God and an ever-deepening fellowship with Him.

The problem of reconciliation arises from the situation which sin brings about. We may not regard God, Who is the Loving Father, as needing to be changed, or propitiated, or made gracious; but we must recognize that the ethical requirements of His love have to be fulfilled if reconciliation is to be effective. God cannot condone sin or treat it as though it does not exist, and sinners must accept the divine judgment upon sin as well as turn from it in repentance and accept a new way of life in obedience. "Sin must be allowed to work itself out in the fires of Holy Love, and it can be overcome only by being borne. From this necessity arises the dilemma of our human predicament: man cannot himself fulfil the conditions of reconciliation, and they cannot be transferred to another." From this point Dr. Taylor constructed a theory which involved an ethical presentation of the representative ministry of Christ. In His life and death Jesus has expressed and effected all that men have neither the power nor the spirituality to achieve, but into which we may progressively enter so that His attitude, mind, and spirit become ours. "We are saved by Him, not in the sense that He suffers in our stead or as our example, but that we may approach the Father in Him".

In the final part of his paper Dr. Taylor went on to argue very powerfully that reconciliation is an ideal to be realized as well as a state into which we are introduced. It is a social as well as an individual experience, and requires the Church, as the Body of Christ, for its fulfilment and ministry. Thus may God's eternal purpose be achieved.

It is hoped that the above summary will give some idea of the rich thought contained in the papers which were read to us. Space does not allow even the attempt to describe the other things which contributed to the success of the Conference, nor indeed can the written word adequately describe them. But a man in speaking of the Conference to his friend would refer gratefully to many memories: the kindly welcome at Westminster College; morning prayers, and the deeply moving Communion Service in its quiet Chapel; strenuous and profitable discussions in Library and Common Room; the sense of fellowship; our pleasure in welcoming as occasional visitors to some of our sessions Dr. A. C. Bouquet and Dr. Carnegie Simpson; and the signal service Dr. C. J. Cadoux did for us on the last morning in surveying the ground we had covered, and summing up the questions in which our thoughts had been engaged.

We began by saying that the Conference quickly came to grips with its subject. It was a great subject, which led us into the deep and urgent matters of our faith. And it is our hope and prayer that the results of our thinking and inquiry will be seen in a firmer grasp of the things that are most surely believed among us, and in a clearer conception of the message which is ours to give in the preaching of the Word.

AN INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF CALVINISTS

By Arthur N. Prior.

An "International Congress of Calvinists", such as that which met at Edinburgh in July, can hardly be expected to awaken the same wide interest as a World Conference on Faith and Order or on Missions or on Life and Work. Such Congresses are, none the less, worth watching closely, for they do represent a type of "œcumenical" activity, however limited a type it might be. One of their most interesting features is that they are able to comprehend groups of Christians which the larger Conferences have not attracted, however heavily this may be overbalanced by the wide range of expressions of Christianity that they inevitably exclude.

It is often loosely thought that the Church of Rome is the only branch of Christendom that is unrepresented in the Life and Work and Faith and Order Movements. As a matter of fact there are also a number of Protestant groups of a theologically conservative or "Fundamentalist" character who have hitherto felt compelled to stand aloof from these œcumenical efforts. It is no doubt very easy for us to argue that the Reunion movements are better without them, as they are better without the Church of Rome; but be that as it may, the Calvinistic Congresses have not only been able to include them, but owe their beginnings and a great deal of their present success to their industry and enthusiasm. It was a handful of Calvinists of this conservative type who organized the first Congress at London in 1932; and, in the present writer's opinion at least, they "builded better than they knew", for Calvinists of quite a different way of thinking—"Barthians" from France and Germany and Switzerland, for example, and "moderate" Calvinists from the National Churches of Scotland and of Holland—began to take an active interest in this new "international", and to-day it forms almost the only movement in which both advocates and critics of "Fundamentalism" may meet and address one another in an atmosphere of mutual respect and friendliness.

It is common to hear the contemporary "renaissance of Calvinism" praised, albeit rather hesitatingly, for having brought back a certain depth and weight to non-Fundamentalist theory. The Edinburgh Congress certainly brought out this aspect of this important modern trend, and did much to help the theologically conservative to see that there are other ways of being "sound on fundamentals" than their own. It would have been difficult, for any of them to question the essential "orthodoxy" of the concluding address by Dr. Vischer of Basle, despite the fact that he is an Old Testament critic—and one of these terrible "higher" critics at that! There was, in fact, a certain hushed unanimity of assent about the reception of Dr. Vischer's paper which was not felt after any of the other addresses; and I think it was a feeling in which quite a number of people who have little reverence for the name of Calvin would have joined had they been present. The paper was entitled "The Significance of the Old Testament for the Christian Life", and showed us simply and graphically how the lives of the men of the Old Testament were lived under the shadow of the Christ Who was to come, and how we of the "New Testament" must in our own way live under His shadow also.

Edinburgh made it clear, however, that the revival of Calvinism has had a beneficent effect in the other camp also. This Reformation creed has not only taught those who are prepared to advance with the times how to hold nevertheless to "the things that remain", but has also taught those

of the "old school" how to defend their position in a much more cogent and well-reasoned way than is usual among them. It was as impossible to dismiss the leading theological conservatives at the Congress as mere obscurantists as it was for them to dismiss their opponents as "heretics". One of them, Dr. V. H. Rutgers, has represented Holland at the League of Nations, and his views on "The Ethical Consequences of the Reformed Faith in the State" were put forward in such a well-knit and coherent fashion that even those of us who felt that they were in many ways wrong and misleading found them singularly difficult to criticize.

This mutual respect and friendship which was introduced through a common desire to learn from the great sixteenth-century Reformer, was all the more significant because of the genuine and deep divergence in the viewpoints concerned. If Barthianism, for example, were merely another form of Fundamentalism, which it is often represented as being, this cordiality between it and Fundamentalism of the more ordinary kind would not be very surprising or important. Anyone, however, who held this view of Barthianism would not retain it for long if he attended a Calvinistic Congress. The Congress held at Geneva in 1936 was a straight-out debate, and a heated one, between the Barthians and the "closed" Calvinists (as M. de Saussure called them at Edinburgh) almost from beginning to end. At Edinburgh one had a distinct impression that this Geneva discussion had been so universally interesting and stimulating that some of the main speakers wished to continue it from where it had been left off, and constructed their papers accordingly. M. de Saussure's address on "Theology and Secular Knowledge", plainly had as its main end the exact formulation of the difference between "open" and "closed" Calvinism, and the defence of the former against the latter. Dr. Rutgers, of the other camp, upheld the doctrine of "common grace" against its Barthian impugners in a very aggressive fashion.

The next International Congress of Calvinists, which will discuss "The Plan of Salvation", is to meet in either Germany or France in 1940.

FOREIGN IMPRESSIONS AND REVIEWS.

THE CONGREGATIONAL PRINCIPLE AS BASIS FOR THE GERMAN PROTESTANT CHURCH.

By Dr. Karl Bornhausen.

[Like most Christians in this country we have been moved to indignation at the Bishop of Gloucester's pronouncements on the German Church question, while on matters social and political we should feel very uneasy were we to find ourselves in the same lobby with him. At Edinburgh last year he stood almost alone in his opposition to the proposal for a World Council of the Christian Churches. In the United States recently papers were put into our hands by the Rev. John F. C. Green, Pastor of the German Evangelical Protestant Church (Congregational), McKeesport, Pa., to whom we are indebted for the translation, showing that a distinguished German theologian supports the Bishop's position. Dr. Karl Bornhausen was Head of the Department of Religion in the University of Frankfurt; he probably still holds the title, though the Nazis have stopped all the courses in religion. In a recent letter he says:

> A university without religion, without a study of comparative religion: it is an anomaly. Yet the quest for religious truth is strong among our youth. And this inquiring attitude of mind is not met because professional information is forbidden.

Dr. Bornhausen has been an exchange-Professor both in Union Seminary, New York, and in Chicago. Nevertheless he holds:

1. That the "Anschluss" was necessary and wise. It was not accomplished by military force; "the soldiery was present only to prevent possible riots instigated by non-Austrian Communists". It was enthusiastically desired by the vast majority of the Austrians, "starved and tortured unto blood". The Evangelical Germans and Roman Catholics alike believed it to be an historical necessity.
2. That the World Council of the Christian Churches proposed at Oxford, Edinburgh, and Utrecht is dangerous and a mistake. It is an attempt at political power and will be resisted by the States. At Edinburgh he believes that the Americans "let the Episcopalians get the better of them". "To me this is further evidence that Americans are ever again deceived by the British. The cool Englishman is naturally superior to the emotional American, so that he is taken in by the schemes of British imperialism; during the World War politically; in Edinburgh and Oxford 1937, ecclesiastically". Democracy mixes religion and politics: "We agree with our Government which forbids the churches to practise such confusion of ideals".
3. That the right development of the Church is organization on Congregational lines, and concentration on spiritual ends only.

Dr. Bornhausen speaks for himself in this letter to Mr. Green which we have obtained permission to quote and in the article which follows. We print them as an expression of a point of view which is rarely heard in this country.

Writing to America in April Dr. Bornhausen said:

The Church-Universal (an organically united church) is neither *evangelical nor Christian*. Into that category fall not only the State Churches of Europe but also the great Churches of America. And if now the Federal Council unites with the great British Churches to form a world-power, the nationalist States will destroy units of these political Churches within their domains. I am constrained to believe that this present tendency of Protestantism represents a very dangerous trend. The States and their peoples have a heavy enough burden to bear in the Roman Catholic Church, as it is. The Greek Catholic Church has already been destroyed. It were not well that the Protestant Great Church be permitted to come into being: it could only be a copy of the Roman Catholic Church. It is significant that the idea centreing about Oxford and Edinburgh comprises an Episcopal World Church. Why is it that its advocates do not realize that Germany could not do otherwise than protest against it? For the objective of this movement is not one of faith but of political power whereby the Church would influence the State. And such a function of the Church is a dead issue outside the Roman Catholic realm. No modern State will accept orders from the Church; but a people will accept counsel from an ethical religion: it will welcome leadership and education, provided kindness and love, not power, are the methods employed. To this end the small churches are sufficient, as is the communion of Christians in many denominations and congregations, each of whose members may be a loyal son of the State. Indeed, a Christian people like ours desires further Christian nurture. Our young people no longer attend church: nor does, indeed, young America. The reason lies in the inability of the majority of the clergy to express themselves with spiritual conviction upon the happenings of the present era. Partly, they dare not; partly, they cannot, owing to the erroneous ostrich-policies of the Churches. Recently I enclosed among the clippings I sent to you a list of announcements of church services from the city of Frankfurt. Is it not of utmost significance that the extra-ecclesiastical meetings of young people, holding Christian services or discussion groups, exceed in number those conducted under the auspices of the Church? Is it not amazing how active is the International Bible Students' Group, as well as the Methodists and the Baptists? This fact denotes the rise of the smaller congregations, as well as the small groups, where each person feels that he has a personal part to play. A confirmation class of one hundred (as is frequent in the Established Church), or a communion service for this one hundred and their parents, is an anomaly. A young friend of mine was alienated from the Church by just such a thing. A service of that sort ceases to be a sacred event, it becomes a project in mass-psychology. The large Churches have not solved the problem. Yet, they now dare to confront the State with conceptions of megalomania that can only portend rivalry with the State. Therefore, I hold that my essay on the Congregational principle as the solution of the German Church problem is correct and wise. It contains the immediate answer for Germany, and ultimately, the programme for the reconstruction of world-Protestantism . . .

Unfortunately, I must visit a bath this May, in the hope of improving my heart. I was wounded so severely in the war that according to the rules I should have died. My light of life has nevertheless continued to burn, and sometimes it has shone; perhaps a longer period of grace may yet be granted to me. At any rate, we veterans of the War know since March 13th, 1938, that we have not lived and suffered in vain; that our nation has gained politically, industrially, and also culturally: and now we hope that also in the realm of religion and Christianity the sacrifices of the German soldiers of the Cross may not have been in vain.—EDITOR.]

THE course of the centuries has seen the development of three distinctive forms of Christian organizations. The Greek Orthodox Church centres in the factual presence of the Holy, best perceived by the people in pictures. This objective presence of the Holy is fact and real without the contribution of man. The Roman Catholic Church conceives the Holy not by means of pictures, but in the authority of the priest, whose power is revealed in the Sacrament wherein the Holy and Salvation are contained. The Church is, therefore, an institution of this priestly authority. This basis of Christian fellowship has also been adopted by many Evangelical Churches. Thus the English High Church is founded upon the authority of the bishops and the theologians, whose Apostolic Succession is supposed to retain the authority of the disciples of Christ and of St. Peter, even unto the present. Likewise, the various State Churches which claim an external authority are based upon spiritual prerogatives of certain personalities, clergy and theologians. Therefore, the German Protestant State Churches have not varied from the Catholic principle, for they substituted for the priest the preacher-theologian, who alone was authorized to

expound and interpret the Word of God. Luther sought to break this alienation of religion from the people by his doctrine of "the priesthood of all believers", which, unfortunately, did not prevail in the progress of the Reformation.

The third possible ecclesiastical structure, that had failed in the Reformation, took form in Congregationalism. Its origins lie in the England of the middle of the 17th century, where it arose in protest against the Anglican Church. The Congregationalists see in the fellowship of the congregation the basis of the Church. Upon the words of Jesus, "Where two or three are gathered together, there I will be in the midst of them" (*Mt.* 18[20]), they base their religious experience of communion of souls, and in them they see their authority as a New Testament Church. By the same authority they deny the all too personal conception of the Roman, the Anglican, and other similarly authoritative Churches, as well as the too factual conception of the Greek Church. To the Congregationalists, the congregation itself is the motivating ground of faith, since the presence of the Saviour in faith and Spirit is thus given.

It is to be remembered that Congregationalism is not only a deduction from the Gospel but is also grounded in the German Reformation. The communion of faith and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit are taught in the Confessional writings of the Reformation and in the Augsburg Confession. In these the reference is frequent and unmistakably made. But churchmen had worldly ambitions, and so the religious foundations of Protestantism were neglected. Their re-emergence in the work of English Free-Churchmen during the 17th century was negatively influenced by political elements, which, however, only came into prominence in New England towards the end of the 19th century. The first Congregationalists in America had confined themselves more closely to the religious principle, being only too glad to have escaped from the political entanglements of Great Britain. They formed everywhere local churches; for the congregation is in unity of fellowship with the community in which it lives as well as with the physical church building. Thus the idea of the Church becomes a reality in a congregation that meets under one roof and submits its assembly to the direct leadership of Jesus Christ. These local churches are each independent of the others; they call their own pastors, as well as their lay leaders; they ordain their pastors. The ground for this spiritual power lies in the faith that the Son of God rules in fellowship and also that God the Father and the Holy Spirit live in the congregation and are in covenant with her. The Congregationalists are also rigid Trinitarians. The Savoy Confession of 1658 clearly states: "Beyond these separate churches Christ has ordained no greater Church, nor a Catholic Church; he has given no other authority for the execution of his authority, nor for the custody of his Gospel".

The Baptists and the Disciples in the United States have also made these basic Congregational principles their own. Thus there is a large group, numerically speaking, that confesses to this Evangelical principle of Congregational faith and practice. According to the World Statistics of 1914 there were 12,703 Congregational churches, chapels, or preaching stations, which is to say, that many congregations.

Though the Congregationalists have continued their allegiance to their origins, as independent congregational units, and although they also continue to experience the grace of the Son of God in the fellowship of the local church, yet, ethically and organizationally, they have been compelled to

unite their many congregations for practical and ideal reasons. The fraternalism of Evangelical Christian life has found expression in mutual counsel and mutual aid; in an extension of a united missionary programme abroad, in education of youth according to their common ideals, as well as in seminaries for the training of their pastors and teachers; in pensions for aged clergy; and in the care of indigent or aged members. Despite the tenacity with which the congregations defended their right to ordain their own pastors by the laying on of hands of elders of their churches, they were compelled to recognize the validity of ordination on the part of other congregations and communions. Thus there evolved a Congregational church government, but of a sort that could never claim special dignity or sanctity or privileges. The leadership of these churches is of the essence of custodianship, and of fellowship with other Congregational churches and with sister denominations. It was, therefore, a matter of course that the Congregationalists became charter members of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ of America. This body has sought and achieved a fraternal co-ordination of the numerous Evangelical Churches of North America. This success came about despite the presence in this body of the Protestant Episcopal Church, whose antecedents, the Anglicans, were the opponents of the Congregationalists, and of the Presbyterians, whose emphasis was placed upon dogma (and, therefore, upon the place of the clergy), wherewith they separated themselves from the Congregational sense of the fellowship of the congregation. These antitheses have been harmonized in the 20th century by the common experience of all groups of a political democracy. All bodies, even the instinctively aristocratic High Church groups, have had to yield to practical democracy in the administration of their affairs. In this evolution the Congregationalists found no conflicting tendencies, for they remained true to their original genius, since the sense of religious fellowship found logical expression in a democratic form of government.

At the Edinburgh Conference, August, 1937, the idea found birth that the three Church groups, the Orthodox, the High Church, and the Congregational, should merge into one system. A committee of the Federal Council was appointed to consider ways and means to this end. But now the Congregationalists sense the impossibility of union with the Church of England. There is not, of course, any difficulty between Churches of various faiths: they may also respect and love one another; likewise, they can all confess Christ as their Head. But it will be impossible for the Churches to agree upon the nature of the authority of Jesus Christ; ever and again will one of the Churches endeavour to impose its own conceptions upon the others, and this, eventually, by force. The Congregationalists now feel that under the leadership of the Church of England they would be forced to accept principles which, for the sake of harmony, they would recognize as Evangelical, but which to them will never be authoritative.

These things seem to me to have great value for the German Church, in intrinsic importance and for didactic purposes. First, it is significant that the New Testament teaching of the local congregation as the body of Christ has now for 300 years been a reality in a significant portion of the Church. The Evangelical Churches of Germany, of Lutheran persuasion, deny the practical applicability of this teaching; they dispute the feasibility of the congregation of laymen. On the contrary, following the Roman Catholic ideology, they have seen in the Church the creation of God. This concept is neither biblical nor is it borne out by historical evolution, since all churchly sanctity has disappeared in the results of critical study and

enlightenment. The Church is a human institution designed to contain and diffuse the Spirit of Jesus Christ. But Jesus did not promise His Spirit to the individual Christian alone, but also, in a creative sense, to His circle of disciples, to the participants of the Holy Supper, and to the body of those that believe in Him, who are comprised in the body of those baptized in His name, who in this symbol have become initiated into His nature. It then becomes obvious that no church is holy in itself—not the lay-church, nor the building, nor the leaders. But they are holy in time and space in degree that the Spirit of God has taken possession of them. This Holy Spirit is absent from a church organization with millions of members which imagines the Spirit must be impressed and contained for reasons of size. Rather does the faith live in the congregation where the spoken word functions as its vehicle, becoming the corollary of the Holy Spirit which God gives to His people. Neither is the Holy Spirit confined to any certain Confession of Faith which may be repeated by many in theoretical identity of comprehension. This pseudo-Lutheran extension of the local congregation of faith to a universal congregation of confession is impossible. Here lies the error of the churchmen who seek unity of faith and Spirit by way of rationalism. It is certain that not a human institution but a sane-fellowship of faith—meeting for converse about the things of faith—is holy and heir of salvation.

How then can the congregation of faith be related to the congregation of the people? Very easily, if she has perceived well her function of faith. The Church of the people is a living Church; in Germany especially she must tolerate within her boundaries a great variety of Confessions. The living Church as a whole is a unity of people; in her parts that means congregations of faith and persons of individualistic piety. A people needs faith for the individual as well as for the whole, to cultivate the spiritual values, to give steadfast and tranquil minds in the vicissitudes of life, to strengthen them for sacrifice in the line of duty and to lead them beyond the realm of the secular, to the standards of the eternal. No people can afford to lack faith, least of all the soldier. These necessary contributions can best be provided by churches of the Congregational order, avoiding by their constitution any conflict with the State where the State consents to the influence of religious attitudes upon the moral life of the citizens. And the German State has given freedom of action to all Confessional groups insofar as they do not imperil public morals or form a danger to the unity of the nation. By these means, the Congregational system, in comparison with the German Evangelical Church, has an open road to our people. It lacks a hierarchy and knows no church politics; her leaders see in the indigenous local church the reason for the congregation of faith. To give spiritual nurture to this congregation is their objective; not by far-fetched dogmas or alien convictions, but by the living sentiments inherent in the members and by their ability to perceive and to approach unto the truth of God and Christ. The German clergy can only then begin slowly to regain their lost leadership of the soul of our people when they devote themselves exclusively to the leadership and nurture of the faith of the congregations, when they concern themselves with the purification and broadening of that faith, by eschewing all dogmatic argumentation, and by fathoming the rich treasury of Christian inheritance in the traditions and customs of the German people. The clergy must be not only the servant of the Word of God, but also the servant of the soul of the German people.

Die kommende Kirche. Von WALTER LÜTHI. Basel: Reinhardt. Mk.3.80.

Drei Predigten über Johannes Kap. 9, 1-7. Von KARL BARTH. Basel: Reinhardt. Mk.1.90.

Die Autoritätslehre in den Werken John Wesleys. Von STANLEY B. FROST, B.D., D.Phil. München: Reinhardt. R.M.3.80.

The Coming Church has for its sub-title "The Message of the Prophet Daniel", and contains short sermons on each of the chapters of *Daniel*. Its contents can best be shown by the titles of these sermons: The Captivity of the Church; The Church as the Steward of the Mystery of God; The Confessing Church; The Office of the Church as Watcher; The Pastoral Office of the Church; The Struggling Church; The Triumphant Church; The Humiliation of the Church; The Church of Sinners; The Praying Church; The Church as Stranger; The Church of the Last Time.

Daniel is not, we imagine, a book that provides modern preachers with many sermons. Lüthi is not concerned with critical problems:

> Whether it pleased God that Daniel should prophesy in the sixth century looking forward, or in the second century looking backward, in no way affects what is the main importance of the book, that it "plies Christ".

Daniel is not to be treated as if it were a

> burnt-out crater. Daniel is an active volcano. Whoso thinks that he can play with its cooled lava . . . . will soon perceive that he is playing with fire.

Short and simple as are these sermons, they have evidently met the needs of many, for the book has passed in a year into its tenth edition. We owe much to the scholars who have taught us to interpret *Daniel* in relation to its historical background. But it is well that we should be reminded that the message of this book is not only for the second century B.C. Lüthi, without allegorizing its words, makes us realize that it, too, speaks to our condition and contains a message of hope and judgment apt to the present distress of the Church. We have read this book with much gratitude and appreciation, and hope it will be translated.

Last quarter we gave a brief review of the immense second half volume of the revised edition of Karl Barth's *Dogmatik*. These three sermons of Barth's show that when he chooses he can be both concise and simple. The sermons deal with our Lord's healing of the blind man. The first, on *John* 9^{1-3}, was, like Lüthi's, preached in Basel; the second, on *John* $9^{4, 5}$, was preached in London; the third, *John* $9^{6, 7}$, to the village Church at Safenwil. These sermons, too, illustrate how fresh and pertinent expository preaching can be if it be the preaching of a man of vivid faith to whom the word of the Bible has become the very Word of God.

The Doctrine of Authority in the Works of John Wesley is a thesis which earned for Dr. Frost his D.Phil. at Marburg. A student of Richmond College, Dr. Frost shows that intimate knowledge of Wesley's writings we have the right to expect from a Methodist scholar. His book is clearly and attractively written, and differs from many theses for a first doctorate in that it is free from pedantry and ostentatious learning. The results of his research are much what we should expect. They show Wesley as a High Churchman and Tory and yet, at the same time, one who taught that in the New Testament there is no real difference between "bishop" and "elder", and that "the unbroken succession is a myth which no one has proved or can prove". Prizing highly the sacraments, he yet

saw that to be baptized and to receive communion was not sufficient to make a man Christian; accepting the plenary inspiration of the Bible, by concentrating on Christian experience he in effect emphasized only that Gospel which is the Word within the Word. This careful study of John Wesley's teaching brings into prominence his insight and wisdom. We wonder what some of the German readers of this book will make of it. John Wesley was typically English in that no theory was allowed to dominate his thought or curb his activity. Though he vigorously attacked all tendencies to reduce Christianity to mere moral teaching, yet his test for the reality of religion was, "Does it work?" As Dr. Frost reminds us, he quotes often the verse:

> Ye different sects, who all declare,
> Lo! here is Christ, or Christ is there!
> Your stronger proof divinely give,
> And show me where the Christians live!

We hope the Epworth Press with its usual enterprise will soon publish an English translation of this fresh and interesting study.

SYDNEY CAVE.

Kierkegaard. By WALTER LOWRIE, D.D. Oxford Press. 25s.

There are few books which would not benefit by shortening, and Dr. Lowrie's, important as it is, is not one of them. While we may be prepared to recognize that Kierkegaard was a genius—as he thought himself to be—and while we may be grateful for all that Dr. Lowrie and others are doing to make his writings accessible to English readers, there are limits to our power of assimilation, and these 600 large pages could have been reduced by one-third with advantage. If Dr. Lowrie had concealed himself a little more, and ruthlessly cut out such sentences as

> At this point I am so indignant, so exasperated with S. K., that I can hardly bear to say another word about this episode

he could have saved much space—especially as there are 7,000 more words before the end of the chapter!

Extravagant claims are being made for Kierkegaard, and it is clear that British scholars will have to estimate his worth, not only because he is compared with Pascal and Nietzche, but because his influence on Barth and the Barthians is as obvious to students as it is recognized by Barth himself. The Synopsis of Kierkegaard's works which Dr. Lowrie gives in an Appendix affords most useful guidance. It contains 43 items, for Kierkegaard had an itching pen. To these writings Dr. Lowrie supplies an interpretation, and very necessary it is, for not only is Kierkegaard's language often as unintelligible as that of Coleridge at his worst, but his books are often a strange mixture of concealed autobiography and philosophical disquisition. Thus he alleges so many and such different reasons for writing *Either/Or*:

> the book was written for Regina; from beginning to end it enunciates a metaphysical position; it is a poetical evacuation, a necessary expectoration; it was a shrewdly planned "deceit" to entrap men into the truth.

Dr. Lowrie, a chivalrous and doughty champion, argues that all the reasons are true at the same time! No wonder that he has to admit "the incapacity of his contemporaries to understand him"!

The purpose of this notice is to draw attention to Dr. Lowrie's book, and to urge its perusal on our readers. A few sentences about Kierkegaard and his career may be welcome. His character was as paradoxical as his

style, and his pathological state, as he himself recognized, often reached the verge of insanity. His deformity, combined with the circumstances of his early life, drove him in upon himself, made him self-centred, egotistical, and also, Dr. Lowrie claims, "the greatest of all journal writers". It is impossible to discuss here his all-important relationship with his father, or his love affair with Regina, or even to begin to outline his writings. He was born in Copenhagen in 1813, and lived only until 1855. Had he been a German rather than a Dane, the world would have known about him long ago. It is only now, a century after he flourished, that the indefatigable efforts of scholars like Dr. Lowrie are making him known to the English-speaking peoples.

If we can give but one example of Kierkegaard's writing, what should it be? He was perhaps at his clearest and best in his onslaught on the Established Church of his land, and in his contrast of the "Christendom" of his day with true Christianity. In much of this, as Dr. Lowrie points out, he echoes Dean Swift's words:

> If it could be proved conclusively to the satisfaction of every one that such a person as Jesus Christ never existed, it might cause a momentary embarrassment even to the Established Church.

Here then is Kierkegaard (and let it be noted he is pronounced *Kerkegor*—the "*e*'s" are short and the "*o*" long):

> It is true the parson (collectively understood) preaches about those glorious ones who sacrificed their lives for the truth. As a rule the parson can very well assume that there is nobody present in the church who could entertain any notion of venturing such a thing. When he is sufficiently assured of this by reason of the knowledge he has of his congregation as its pastor, he preaches without embarrassment, he declaims vigorously and wipes the sweat from his brow. If the following day there came to see the parson at his home one of those resolute men who do not declaim, a quiet, modest, perhaps plain-looking man, announcing himself as one who had been carried away by the parson's eloquence so that now he had resolved to offer his life for the truth—what then? Then the parson would reply to him good-humouredly as follows: "Why, Merciful Father in Heaven! How did you get such an idea into your head? Travel a bit, you need diversion, take a laxative". And suppose the plain-looking man, his tranquillity unaltered, modestly fixed his eye upon him and continued, with his glance steadily fixed upon him, to talk about his resolution, but with the modest expressions which a resolute man always uses—this parson would surely say to himself, "Would that this man were far away!".

A good many misprints, such as "Josiah Roice", need attention.

EDITOR.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

"Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider."—FRANCIS BACON.

"A good book is the precious life-blood of a master-spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."—JOHN MILTON.

(*The place of publication is London unless otherwise stated.*)

The Validity of the Gospel Record. By E. F. SCOTT, D.D. Nicholson & Watson. 8s. 6d.

Did Christ Really Live? By H. G. WOOD, D.D. S.C.M. 5s.

Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels. By R. H. LIGHTFOOT, D.D. Hodder. 8s. 6d.

Here are three books which every minister of religion and every student of the Gospels ought to read.

When a scholar with the learning, insight, and lucid style of Dr. E. F. Scott sets out to work on the all-important question of the Gospels, the result is bound to be at once fruitful and fascinating. Dr. Scott examines form criticism with the skill of a barrister, and his conclusions, though he will often raise the hair of fundamentalists, are re-assuring to those who have feared for the historicity of the Gospels. He believes that the Church, though selecting those things in the life and teaching of Jesus which appeared worth preserving (and with a view to public recital) and giving them permanence by throwing them into certain patterns, nevertheless did not devise the tradition. He insists that the early Christians were at once more cultured and conservative than the modern critics allow, and reiterates that the Gospels are a selection from a mass of material, tested first orally and then in writing. The Church's theology, including that of Paul, consisted in "the apprehension of the fact"—"the history was itself the revelation". The Gospels were written for a religious purpose which they could only fulfil by a true narration of the facts. A great little book. Details on pp. 88 and 131 need attention.

Dr. H. G. Wood has rendered timely service in *Did Christ Really Live?* Many Christians who have never heard of Dr. Couchoud and M. Loisy's reply to him have been disturbed by talk about myth and by the statements they now frequently hear that we cannot be sure we have any of the words Jesus Himself spoke. Dr. Wood takes the late J. M. Robertson as one of the best exponents of the Christ-Myth School, and follows him through all his turnings and twinings, showing his inconsistencies, his changes of front, and his absurdities. Possibly he gives him more attention than he really deserves, but it will do students good to see how easily a citadel falls when subjected to a sustained assault like this. Dr. Wood sets his feet on the solid rock of history and ends with the confident assertions which will reassure many, not only that Jesus "suffered under Pontius Pilate", but that He "died to make us good".

Dr. Wood mentions Prof. Lightfoot without naming him in a reference to a

> brilliant series of Bampton Lectures whch will leave on the mind of the ordinary reader the impression that even in *Mark* there is a great deal of interpretation and very little history.

With that reminder before us we turned to Prof. Lightfoot's new book, which, slight as it is, and full of interest, is nevertheless rather two series of lectures than a unity. In the first two lectures he argues that *Mk.* ends at 16^8; there is no reason in the form (other examples of sentences and paragraphs ending in γάρ are cited) or the content why the book should not end at this point. The remaining four lectures deal with the subject suggested in the title. If sometimes Prof. Lightfoot is inclined to lay on a word more than it will bear (*e.g.*, "seeking" in Mk. 16^6) he continually keeps his readers thinking. He shows that in *Mt.* and *Mk.* the scene of importance after the resurrection is Galilee, in *Lk.* Jerusalem; in the two former the resurrection is preparatory to a final event, in *Lk.* it is itself the consummation; in the former the stress is on the Risen Christ's office as Son of man, in the latter as Messiah. The lectures on *Jn.* are hurried and the least satisfactory in the volume. If to *Mk.* and *Mt.* Galilee is "the area of salvation", and if to *Lk.* the whole land, but especially Jerusalem, in *Jn.* the *patris* of Jesus is not Galilee or Nazareth, but Judea and Jerusalem; "Jerusalem holds the chief place in *Jn.* because the cross stood there".

It will be seen from this brief summary that Prof. Lightfoot is working along suggestive lines. Streeter has already taught us to link the Gospels with localities; now we are carried a step further. One minor point: we agree with the reduction of capitalization to the utmost, but we doubt if "greek", "english", "hebrew", "jewish" can be defended.

EDITOR.

The Historical Background of the Bible. By J. N. SCHOFIELD. Nelson. 7s. 6d.

This, as the author admits, is an ambitious book. Its aim is to present the background of both Testaments, to give an account of archæological discoveries that illuminate the Bible story, and to describe the rise and fall of the Jewish people. As an addendum there is a chapter on present day Palestine and its problems.

The ambition has been realized. Mr. Schofield has had the double advantage of four years' residence in Egypt and Palestine, including instruction from the well-known and reliable archæologist, W. F. Albright; and of having his book "vetted" by such masters as S. A. Cook and H. Wheeler Robinson. He writes in an easy style, and is very adept at his task of adjusting the Bible story to its extra-biblical framework. Both scholar and general reader will find the book exceedingly serviceable.

There is no room to go into much detail, but it may be noted that Mr. Schofield thinks that the "documentary" theory of the Pentateuch may come to yield to a "stratum" theory which recognizes additions and alterations in the text. (Something of this nature may also be in store for the Gospel narrative.) On the date of the Exodus he is for the reign of Merenptah, *i.e.*, the end of the 13th century B.C.; in this he is not alone, despite the rather clamant opinions of those who put it back to the 16th or the 14th century.

The chapters that deal with the historical books of the *O.T.* and the prophets are particularly valuable; the outstanding personalities and incidents being shown in true perspective in the light of contemporary inscriptions and other archæological evidence. The paragraphs on the fate of the Northern Kingdom, pp. 179-181, are "highly commended".

The *N.T.* section is notable for its admirable discussion of the difficulties that confronted the Roman procurators in Palestine, not the least of which was the unique position of the Jewish high-priest.

Touching Palestine to-day the author shares the opinion voiced by other shrewd observers that Britain may now claim to have fulfilled her obligations as regards Jewish immigration. The established Jewish communities should have protection and a measure of self-government, but Palestine is and ought to be an Arab country like Transjordania.

On p. 251 the reference to *1 Macc.* 2^{4f} is inaccurate, and we might on p. 301 have been given the name of the Jewish king in Egypt.

ALEX. J. GRIEVE.

Ancient Smyrna. By C. J. CADOUX, M.A., D.D. Blackwell. 25s.

The number of people competent to appraise this massive piece of research must be comparatively few, and the present reviewer readily confesses that he is not of their number. Many men have had statues erected to them in the place of their birth (Dr. Cadoux is a native of Smyrna) for more slender filial services than this.

The book, which is an amplification of an earlier essay that ran only to A.D. 180, falls in a sense into two parts, or makes its appeal to two interests—classical or pre-Christian, and early Christian. The author is at home in both. After an introductory chapter on the geographical data he discusses pre-Hellenic Smyrna (here, of course, Homer comes in), which was destroyed by Alyattes *c.* 580 B.C. For three centuries Smyrna was just a cluster of villages, but Lysimakhos (Dr. Cadoux is an advocate of the movement for the classical spelling of proper names—hence Polykarp, Antiokhos, Eirenaios, Ephesos, *etc.*) refounded the city *c.* 288 B.C., and for 160 years it was autonomous. Then it came under Roman rule. Two intercalary chapters dealing respectively with the city's civil and religious life and institutions in classical times bring us to the Christian era, but not immediately to the Christian story. Pagan Smyrna under the pre-Constantinian emperors, *i.e.*, from 27 to 324 B.C., receives adequate treatment, the fortunes of the city under each emperor and its outstanding personalities being described with remarkable fullness and clarity.

Smyrna does not attain to the first rank among the city-centres of Early Christianity, and apart from the story of its great hero Polykarp there is not a great deal of material. Dr. Cadoux naturally tells that story with the fullness it merits, and in this connexion we may note especially his thorough-going investigation into the *Vita Polycarpi* of Pionios, whose work he concludes to be in the main trustworthy; and some acute observations on the letter(s) of Polykarp and Dr. Harrison's recent solution of that hoary problem. But it is good also to be introduced to some of Polykarp's forerunners, *e.g.*, Stratias, Arist(i)on, Boukolos; and interesting to have the author's opinion that the *Apocalypse* was the work of John the Apostle. It need hardly be said that he is "sound" on the question of the constitution and ministry of the primitive church (p. 313). The concluding chapter, after references to the Paschal controversy and the Noetian heresy, is mainly devoted to the Decian persecution and the martyrdom of Pionios.

The index, the maps, the footnotes, are as satisfying as the book itself, and the whole forms a contribution to learning, and indeed to faith, of which Congregationalism should be proud. We join in the author's hope of a happy future for Smyrna (or should it be Izmir?) and congratulate him on his labour of love and piety.

ALEX. J. GRIEVE.

The Enigma of the Fourth Gospel. By Robert Eisler. Methuen. 12s. 6d.

> This book endeavours to oust from the Community of Saints and from the calendar of the church the mawkish wholly mythical figure of a Christianized Ganymede (that hermaphroditic counterpart of the emasculated pagan god Attis) which does duty in current devotional imagery, as a portrait of the Fourth Evangelist.

So runs the "jacket"—a not very promising opening, on several counts. But the book is not as disappointing as one might fear from this. It is a series of brief sections rather than chapters—there are 43 of them in the 213 pages. They have some resemblance to the pieces of a jig-saw puzzle, though the author would probably regard them as a series of stepping-stones. But in the one case one cannot help feeling that the pieces have to be forced and squeezed into position rather than dovetailing neatly, and in the other that here and there the traveller instead of reaching the next stone finds himself in the water, *e.g.*, in the matter of the alleged early martyrdom of John the Apostle. And yet it is a fascinating study. Although the verdict may be "not proven", and Dr. Eisler be numbered among the trail-blazers to whom he pays fit homage (and whose portraits add much to the interest of the book) rather than the consummator of their labours, he has brought together a number of valuable data, and given us a very convenient book of reference with regard to sundry matters, especially the Latin prologues to the Gospels, not otherwise within easy reach of the average reader or student.

Dr. Eisler's story runs thus. Among the sons of Annas the high priest was one John, who as a boy knew Jesus and witnessed His crucifixion. As a young man he became an assessor in the law-court and cast his vote according to the advice of Gamaliel when Peter and John were arraigned. He was high-priest from 37 to 41 under his Greek name Theophilus, and an army commander in the revolt of 66. Exiled in Ephesus, the Zealot turned Quietist (this is very much like the normal conception of John, Son of Thunder, the apostle of love), and his fame as John the Elder spread far and wide. Luke dedicated his books to him. Among those who visited him was Marcion (who is becoming as troublesome to us as he was to his second century contemporaries). Marcion brought with him "scriptures", among them the reminiscences of the Beloved Disciple, to wit Lazarus of Bethany. Yielding to the persuasion of Marcion, who offered himself as amanuensis, the old man dictated the Fourth Gospel. But the scribe (like the woman who read the Bible to her blind husband and put in many a bit "for his good") interpolated so much of his own that he was repudiated, and the aged John had to revise the work as best he could. Dr. Eisler promises a further volume on Marcion's "scriptures" and Lazarus.

Alex. J. Grieve.

Symbolism and Belief. By Edwyn Bevan. Allen & Unwin. 15s.

Dr. Bevan was Gifford lecturer in 1933 and 1934. Since then he has been revising and expanding his lectures, and the result is the present volume. We may say at once that it is quite the most weighty contribution to philosophical theology of recent years. It deals with a question of first-rate importance—that our language in regard to God and unseen things is necessarily symbolical. How far, then, does it represent any kind of reality? At the present time, when we are constantly being told that anything beyond the reach of the senses is illusion, it is indeed good to have from a thinker like Dr. Bevan so strong a presentation of the other side.

The symbols with which Dr. Bevan deals are not those of cultus, but rather of idea. He deals first with Height: God is the High and Holy One, the Most High God. Then with Time: God is Eternal—an admirable discussion of the whole problem of the time process. Then with Light, Spirit, and the Wrath of God—on this latter, again, a most illuminating discussion. Then, in the second part of his book, he gathers together the conclusions of his study of symbolism and deals with the distinction between the literal and the symbolical, Pragmatism, Rationalism and Mysticism, and has a final lecture on the Justification of Belief. It is symptomatic of his whole attitude that the last sentence of this lecture should be, "What actually causes anyone to believe in God is direct perception of the Divine".

Dr. Bevan's whole argument is directed to show that the symbols with which he is dealing all point to Reality. It is not a question merely of feeling that this may be so because such feeling is pleasurable and answers to our wishes, but because "at the very heart of all that can properly be called religion is the conviction that what is apprehended is an immense Reality". To regard religion as an emotional reaction without any spiritual content is absurd. As to symbolism itself Dr. Bevan agrees wth Dean Mansel that the simpler the form it takes the better. He contends that

> anthropomorphic imagery may give us the essence of the Reality better than an abstract metaphysical formula, which will be just as much beset by the limitations of the human mind and may deceive by its pretence to superior knowledge.

This contains a very necessary caveat and one that some of our dogmatic theologians would do well to keep in mind. Dr. Bevan's general conclusion comes very near to pragmatism, though, as he contends, it is pragmatism with a difference. He argues that if our conceptions of God point to a Reality, it is because they conduce to a better life, and this differs from pragmatism in that it refers all through to an independent Reality. He illustrates the point thus:

> The Christian believes that God is a loving Father. But he does not merely say "act as if there were a God who is a loving father and you will find certain desirable results follow (that is pragmatism)". He says, "act as if there were a God who is a loving father, and you will in so doing be making the right response to that which God really is".

This meagre summary of Dr. Bevan's position gives no idea of the wealth of learning and acuteness of argument with which he supports it. He has produced a book for which every student of religion will remain permanently in his debt.

W. B. Selbie.

T. E. Hulme. By Michael Roberts. Faber. 10s. 6d.

Mr. Roberts has written a very interesting account of a brilliant man, who was cut off unfortunately in early life by the Great War. Born in 1883, he was killed by a shell when at the front in 1917.

The characteristic which makes Hulme notable is that, while he was a man of powerful intellect, he was acutely sensitive to the new ideas which were already making themselves felt in philosophy and literary criticism in the early years of the twentieth century, and which since the war have expanded their influence and have been dominant among large sections of the thinking world. The general tendency of these new ideas was revolt

from the standards and aims of the nineteenth century, and in many cases return to the thought of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Thus in philosophy Hulme particularly admired Pascal, and in poetry he preferred Pope. It is admitted that he himself originated nothing; but he caught the impulse of fresh movements before others, just as one yacht with special sails may catch a breeze, while others lie becalmed. Thus he became, as it were, a symbol for the new movements, a pointer showing their direction and a symptom showing their force. The value of a description of him and his ideas is just that it helps us better to understand the intellectual forces of our age by seeing how they impressed a mind at once powerful and sensitive.

Hulme was influenced by Bergson and Sorel, by Kierkegaard, Husserl, Dilthey, and Scheler, also by Moore (of the *Principia Ethica*), and by the æsthetic critic Worringer. His great enemies were liberalism and romanticism: he disbelieved in progress and believed in original sin; he recognized the finitude of man and was as strongly opposed as Keble to any attempt

to wind ourselves too high
For sinful man beneath the sky.

As regards his general philosophical view, that was adopted from Pascal, with the help of Husserl and Dilthey. These philosophers distinguished in philosophy two parts, one strictly scientific and critical, the other personal and more akin to poetry: they called the latter *Weltanschauung* (world-perspective).

Hulme held that the scientific part of philosophy consisted on the one hand of mathematical physics and on the other of the intuitive certainties of religion and ethics. Between these two fixed planes, as it were, of an earth below him and a heaven above him, man walks guiding himself in particulars by a perspective personal to himself which can never be scientifically justified. Hulme regarded the humanism and romanticism of the nineteenth century as a *Weltanschauung* or personal philosophy simply, and actively dissented from it towards a different *Weltanschauung* more like that of the Middle Ages. He says:

> To illustrate big things by small ones I feel, myself, a repugnance towards the *Weltanschauung* (as distinguished from the technical part) of all philosophy since the Renaissance. In comparison with what I can vaguely call the religious attitude, it seems to me trivial. I am moved by Byzantine mosaic, not because it is quaint or exotic; but because it expresses an attitude I agree with.

Hulme admired Pope, because he thought that he undertook the proper task of poetry, the description of finite things by means of images. His objection to romanticism was that the romantic artist distorts and exaggerates his material, giving to human affairs the perfection and universality that belong to the divine and to abstract ideas.

In the nature of the case nothing is worked out in Hulme's speculations: his exponent indeed has to comment upon various contradictions apparent among his conceptions. But this want of finish does not destroy the value or interest either of Hulme's philosophy or of the book about him, in which Mr. Roberts has done his work well. Hulme becomes typical of a seething age, breaking away from old moorings, and not knowing very well where it is going. To all who want to realize and understand the strange motions of the time in which we live, whether to agree with them or disagree with them, the book may be warmly recommended.

Robert S. Franks.

An Introduction to the Study of Ascetical and Mystical Theology. By Archbishop Goodier, S.J. Burns, Oates. 7s. 6d.

We have here the substance of lectures given at Heythrop College, Chipping Norton, which is the headquarters of the English Jesuits for theological studies. The book is of the nature of an encyclopædia of the subject of which it treats : it contains successively a historical, a dogmatic, and a practical portion. It has therefore both the merits and the defects of an encyclopædia : it gives a conspectus of the whole subject, but does not go deeply into any part of it. The author says that his work has been criticized just upon this ground ; but that he deliberately chose this method of treatment as the best for his purpose : it seemed to him that no subject of theology more required a treatment from the point of view of the whole, and to this end he was prepared to sacrifice fullness of detail. As an Introduction to the subject, therefore, Archbishop Goodier's book may be useful ; but if anyone wants properly to understand the ascetic and mystical theology of the Roman Church, he will have to supplement his reading of this volume by first-hand studies of some of the great mystics such as St. Teresa and St. John of the Cross. The most interesting part of the present work is the practical part, which treats of the ways to perfection. These are the three methods of the interior life which Catholicism accepted from Neoplatonism : the purgative way, the illuminative way, and the unitive way. Under the first come penance and mortification ; under the second the practice of the virtues ; and under the third contemplation ; each way also has its own characteristic mode of prayer. In general ascetism or self-discipline stands for the human part of the process ; while mysticism stands for the divine part. Man does what he can to prepare himself and God infuses His grace into the heart : the two together make up the spiritual life.

To study such a review of the spiritual discipline of Rome must be instructive to the evangelical Christian ; but there are two things that will probably prevent him from feeling really at home in its atmosphere. One is the exclusively Roman outlook, which sees no saints except those of its own Church, and mentions Luther only to reprimand the principle of private judgment and Cromwell only to regret his "Manichæanism" ! The other is the way in which the whole spiritual life is regimented and its processes tabulated and docketed : the spontaneity expressed in the maxim "Love and do as you like" is singularly absent. One is reminded of Goethe's criticism of the *collegium logicum* :

> There will your mind be drilled and braced,
> As if in Spanish boots 'twere laced . . .
> Days will be spent to bid you know
> What once you did at a single blow
> Like eating and drinking, free and strong—
> That one, two, three ! thereto belong.

A very different ideal of the spiritual life is expressed in Montgomery's familiar but beautiful lines :

> Prayer is the soul's sincere desire,
> Uttered or unexpressed,
> The motion of a hidden fire
> That burns within the breast.

Such a description seems to agree better with the teaching of Jesus, who represents prayer to God, our Heavenly Father, as being as natural and spontaneous as the child's appeal to the father in his home on earth.

Robert S. Franks.

Cambridge Sermons. By Edwyn Clement Hoskyns, Bart., D.D. S.P.C.K. 6s.

Cambridge Sermons is a very welcome memorial to Sir Edwyn Hoskyns, whose death last year at the early age of fifty-three brought a great sense of loss to all of us who knew him. Sir Edwyn Hoskyns was far from being a typical Cambridge theologian. Learning he had, but he could never be content with scholarship for scholarship's sake; nor did he use the studied understatement, the cautious reserve of phrase, of many of his older colleagues. An Anglo-Catholic, and the Dean of a College not friendly to Free Churchmanship, he yet exercised a great influence on Free Church as well as Anglican theological students. Older scholars might feel that he was too confident in his assertions, and at times over ingenious in his suggestions, but his students prized much the enthusiasm with which he conveyed to them the discoveries he had made in the New Testament like one who had bought a piece of ground and found it full of nuggets of gold.

The volume before us contains a warm eulogy written by Mr. Charles Smyth, who describes himself as one of those whom Hoskyns delivered from the "tyranny of that Liberal Humanitarianism in which old-fashioned agnosticism had naturally tended to take refuge". "Catholic" as Sir Edwyn called himself, he was one who learnt much from Barth, of whose *Commentary on Romans* he made a remarkable translation, and he was associated in his last years in the work of Kittel's *Wörterbuch*—that indispensable aid to study of the New Testament. The influence both of Barth and of his lexicographical work can be clearly seen in this volume of sermons.

It was Sir Edwyn's custom to preach series of sermons in the Chapel of Corpus Christi. We have here given us the series on Eschatology; the very notable series on Sin; the series on The Vocabulary of the New Testament; and on The Homilies. We have read this volume with the greatest interest. The sermons are too succinct and condensed to be "popular". But in this little book there is much stimulus to thought. These sermons illustrate yet once more how much more pertinent to our modern need is the Gospel of the New Testament than those dilutions of it which claimed to be modern and now seem not only out of date but irrelevant to a time of crisis such as that in which we live.

Sydney Cave.

The Founding of the Church Universal. By Hans Lietzmann. Nicholson & Watson. 10s. 6d.

This is Vol. II of the "Beginnings of the Christian Church", the first volume under that title having been reviewed in these pages in 1937. Dr. Bertram Lee Woolf is again the translator and has discharged the task with admirable skill and lucidity. He leaves us eagerly anticipating the further volumes which are to complete this scholarly work in its English dress.

The first volume dealt with the apostolic and sub-apostolic periods and carried on the narrative and its interpretation as far as the Gnostic movement. The volume before us takes us to the middle of the third century and deals in thirteen chapters with the World Empire in the second and third centuries, the development of the episcopate, the Canon of the New Testament, the Rule of Faith, Worship, Persecution, and the work of the Apologists, and the growth and special characteristics of the Church in Asia Minor, Gaul, Africa, Rome, Syria, and Egypt. The characteristics noted in the earlier volume, ample scholarship, combined with independence of judgment and appreciation of religious values, are manifest here also. Many figures appear in a new light. Callistus and Bardesanes, for example, are

presented more sympathetically than is usually the case, and their achievements are justly appraised. The influence of Montanism in Rome and Southern Gaul is given fuller recognition, while the tendency to regard the Apologists as mere moralists for whom Christianity is a new law rather than a Gospel is strongly resisted. Much more might be said in appreciation, but it should suffice to say that no student can afford to neglect this work.

We have noted a few unfortunate misprints, *e.g.*, p. 161 "Hosianna"; p. 277 "Impassable" for "Impassible"; p. 294 "hesistate"; p. 303 "Carthaginean"; p. 304 (full-stop for semi-colon); p. 365 "Constantinoplitan"; p. 368 "propreptikos"; p. 371 and p. 372 "Protrepikos"; p. 379 "Stromateus"; p. 413 "Valentinean"; p. 421 "Hart" for "Hort". On p. 280 we have the statement that "the body of Christ had been laid in the earth and there decayed after his death". We have not the German before us, but the context seems to require "Christian" instead of "Christ".

E. J. Price.

The History of Israel. By H. Wheeler Robinson, D.D. Duckworth. 5s.

Of making of Histories of Israel there is no end, but even so there is ample justification for this new presentation of the "Facts and Factors" by the author of *The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament* that was published in the same series 25 years ago and still retains its place as the best available introduction to the religion of Israel. The new volume professes to be no more than an introduction for the use of students and others who need a preliminary survey of the history in its modern interpretation before proceeding to more exacting studies. The book will admirably fulfil that purpose. Nevertheless it will be read with interest and profit by more advanced scholars, more especially perhaps the closing chapter on the philosophy of history as illustrated by the history of Israel, which was originally prepared as a presidential address to the Oxford Society for Historical Theology. In following the story of Israel from the Exodus right up to the Roman period, the reader is under the safe and congenial guidance of one of our most distinguished Old Testament scholars.

E. J. Price.

Courtoisie in Anglo-Norman Literature. By C. B. West, M.Litt., Ph.D. (Medium Aevum Monographs, III). Blackwell. 10s. 6d.

The main theme of the *courtois* literature of the Middle Ages is love, and, as Dr. West remarks, "the particular ideal of love which forms the basis of *courtoisie*" is of such a special kind that it "can only be described by the distinctive term *'amour courtois'* or 'courtly love' ".

The book opens with an Introduction outlining the theory of courtly love, which was based on feudal relationships. It was first expounded by the troubadours of Southern France, spread to the *trouvères* of the North, and thence into Anglo-Norman literature. After a concise sketch of the historical background of the latter, Dr. West examines its romances, lyrical, didactic, and religious verse in turn for evidences of *"amour courtois"*. She quotes numerous examples throughout her work, showing that Anglo-Norman writers were quite familiar with the theory and phraseology of the subject, but concludes that the influence of the courtly poets of France on them was not fundamental, but only superficial. They were far less interested in psycho-analysis than were the *trouvères* and the troubadours, because they were more practical—and, one might add, more moral. They regarded marriage as the logical outcome of love, which the poets on the other side of the Channel did not.

Dr. West is to be congratulated on her thorough piece of research, and on the clarity with which she presents the results of it. We hope for further contributions from her in what is a neglected field of literary study.

F. Brittain.

SHORTER NOTICES AND DESCRIPTIVE LIST.

*(Books marked * are recommended for ministerial reading.)*

The latest of the "Biblical Biographies" (Rich & Cowan, 5s.) is Dr. H. Costley-White's *Abraham of Ur*. The author had the unenviable task of making bricks without straw, for even Sir Leonard Woolley's discoveries added to *Genesis* do not tell us much about Abraham; it is to be feared that Dr. Costley-White lacks sufficient of the imaginative and descriptive gift to make a colourful biography in these circumstances. He is a "white-washer" rather than a "debunker", and leans strongly to the conservative side. Perhaps the greatest merit of his book is that it may introduce to Biblical criticism readers who might otherwise have remained in ignorance of it.

For some reason we did not receive Mr. Louis Golding's *In the Steps of Moses the Lawgiver,* but now we have read its continuation, *In the Steps of Moses the Conqueror* (Rich & Cowan, 7s. 6d.), and we must repair the omission as soon as possible. Not that, judging from the present book, we expect to learn much about Moses that is not in the Old Testament or the Talmud, but the narrative is sure to be readable and the picture of the background valuable. This second volume has two heroes, Moses and T. E. Lawrence, and it is not easy to determine which is the more important; as Mr. Golding and his party follow in their steps they have many adventures, and a considerable part of the route they followed in Trans-jordania has changed so little during the centuries that their experiences throw light on many Biblical passages.

In *"Let's Look at the Bible!"* (Nelson, 3s. 6d.) Canon E. Basil Redlich discusses the stories of the Bible with three imaginary but typically modern children of intermediate age. The book is cast in the form of Sunday morning conversations.

Mr. D. T. Niles, the author of **Sir, we would see Jesus* (S.C.M., 2s.), is a young Christian leader in Ceylon, now engaged in the work of evangelism. It is about evangelism that he writes, and with such freshness and understanding that Christians in all lands and churches would do well to read his little book. It suggests many sermons to ministers (a most timely series, *e.g.*, on pp. 60-61) and will cause them much heart searching at the same time. See "Worth Noting".

Dr. A. B. Macaulay prefixes to a volume of Dr. H. R. Mackintosh's *Sermons* (Clark, 7s.) a beautiful memoir for which Mackintosh's friends and the hosts of students who are indebted to him will be very grateful. The sermons are excellent examples of scholarly Scottish preaching; in reading them we could not help but be struck by the fact that while the illustrations dated—Tennyson, Browning, Huxley, Darwin—the themes were timeless.

In *The Church Through the Centuries* (Scribners, 8s. 6d.) Prof. C. C. Richardson, of Union Seminary, has given us a very useful and timely book in which he has compressed into 250 pages a historical summary and suggestive commentary. Whether he is speaking of the Early Church, the Reformation period, or modern times, Dr. Richardson is amazingly

fresh, no matter how familiar the ground, sometimes carrying the reader with him, sometimes not. He often sees trends and emphases that are overlooked. Here are some examples:

> The early Christians started with an awareness of the unity of the whole people of God, of which individual congregations were but the representative and local manifestations.
>
> The danger that faces Augustine's position is that the Catholic organization may become a god-defying Church, which sets itself up as God upon earth.
>
> Classical Protestantism was not individualistic. While it recognized the infinite worth of the individual before God, it was emphatic upon the corporate nature of Christian life.

The Church of England has no abler theologian than Canon O. C. Quick, but it is not only members of his own Church who will be grateful for his "essay in systematic theology", *Doctrines of the Creed* (Nisbet, 10s. 6d.). Ministers whose college days are fast receding will find much intellectual stimulus if they use this book as a "refresher course". Canon Quick divides his subject into four parts: The Christian Faith in God; the Incarnation; The Christian Doctrine of Salvation; The Holy Spirit and the Church. The short select bibliography which is added will also be found useful. The fact that at times the reader will be stirred to protest by no means detracts from the book's value. We pondered long the sentence:

> But it is at least extremely difficult to maintain the "organic" view of the church's order, unless one is prepared to admit that episcopacy is *in some way* essential to that order.

Unless the explanation is to be found in the "quotes" round the word "organic" these words convey to us no meaning at all. Have there not been times, are there not now places, where there has been Church order of an "organic" kind—and yet no bishops?

While it will surprise those who know anything about the Anabaptists to see Calvinism called "the revolutionary 'Bolshevik' element in the Continental Reformation", they and others will find Dr. C. S. Phillips's *The Background of the Prayer Book* (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.) a compact little volume. Without doubt Anglicans who master this book and answer the questions at the end will be much better Anglicans, but perhaps it takes an outsider to realize how remote many of these pages are from the world of today.

One of our pleasantest recollections of a Hellenic cruise is of Monsignor A. S. Barnes as a table-companion, not least because of the skilful way he invariably stole the thunder of an Anglican dignitary. Often in his knowledge of men and of books and in his whimsical humour he reminded us of Rendel Harris. Of the beloved Quaker we have often thought in reading *Christianity at Rome in the Apostolic Age* (Methuen, 8s. 6d.), which Monsignor Barnes left ready for the press on his death two years ago; in the persuasive way in which they press a theory and the childlike way in which they suggest a staggering emendation or interpolation the two are very much alike: if we read "John" for "Paul" here or "Mark" for "Clement" there, that will fit very well! And so it does. And similarly in modern illustrations of ancient problems; *e.g.*, the reference to the Oxford bookseller's catalogue:

Mill.	On Liberty.	3s. 6d.
do.	On the Floss.	2s. 6d.

Among other things Monsignor Barnes "proves" that the first Epistle of Clement was written in 70 not 96! But *Revelation* was also written at an early date (68), and by the Apostle John who wrote the Gospel and the Epistles. Always the traditional authorship is accepted, which makes all the more remarkable the ingenuity with which Monsignor Barnes deals with Peter and Paul—and John—in Rome.

Mr. R. Ellis Roberts has collected an unusual group of writers in the "I Believe" series (Heinemann, 5s. each) which is to form "a focus for the creative artists". Having read the first five volumes we are more impressed by the Editor's "Preface" and "Argument" than by the contributions of his team, interesting and unusual as they are. Mr. Ellis Roberts believes that the great danger of civilization today comes from the tyranny of fear, the worship of power, and from man's refusal to endure the burden of spiritual liberty. He sees the two outstanding characteristics of our age in the revival of violence and the revival of religion:

> The most extreme conflict is that between those who believe in the world of freedom and those who believe in the world of fate. Between the disciples of reason and the instruments of the unconscious. Between the children of the spirit and the servants of the machine.

This is well said, and it makes us wish that Mr. Roberts had given us a volume himself rather than search for others to handle his theme. Mr. J. D. Beresford (*What I Believe*), possessed of "predominantly a sceptical mind" even to a distrust of its own conclusions, describes his mental pilgrimage, which has led him to a point where the first article of his creed is that this is a spiritual and not a material universe. He is much concerned with the question of immortality and claims it is a fact that those who realize one-ness with the spirit *know* their immortality before physical death. Mr. Gerald Bullett, however (*Problems of Religion*), does not regard personal immortality as a necessary concomitant of theism. Nevertheless, the real issue is not between theism and atheism but between "those who apprehend a universal mystery and those who do not". Mr. Bullett, who would do well to peruse Dr. H. G. Wood's *Did Christ Really Live?*, thinks that the world is drifting towards hell and needs religion, but Christianity cannot meet the need because of its anthropomorphic theism and its Jesuolatry. He regards "the survival of the Old Testament as a religious textbook as one of the major disasters in human history".

Miss Renée Haynes calls her contribution *Pan, Cæsar and God,* and it is almost as impossible to understand her title as to see how her survey of the religions of China, India, Greece, and Israel can be called a "personal statement", or to keep one's breath in her rushing spate of words. Apparently she believes that in Jesus were integrated the fragmentary contradictory perceptions of God of China, India, and Greece. Where Cæsar comes in we cannot see.

It is refreshing to emerge from Miss Haynes's opulent jungle and see before us on the hill-side the white if winding path of Mr. Kenneth Ingram's **And He Shall Come Again.* In his exposition of the doctrine of the Second Coming Mr. Ingram has given us an important book, though he should quote names and dates correctly (p. 54) and he does at the end obtrude his obsession "Christianity to the Left!". The book contains an admirable if succinct summary of the doctrine in the Church, and shows how in the teaching of Jesus there are two radically opposed traditions, Jewish and Greek, in regard to it. He does not believe the Parousia has happened:

> Either Christ's revelation is much less significant than Christians have assumed, and must be relegated to the level of that of many other religious prophets who had a part to play in their day, but whose *rôle* was limited; or else His Kingdom and His Parousia means something which has yet to be disclosed—and His teaching contains a truth which has not been discovered.

Mr. Ingram goes on to argue that the need is for Christians to recognize the unity of the spiritual and the material and of the two great commandments of Jesus, and to see that Christ's Second Coming presupposes man's intense creative activity. This thought-provoking study deserves careful reading.

When we come to No. 5, Mr. Charles Williams's *He Came Down Out of Heaven,* we confess ourselves entirely baffled—baffled by its appearance as a "personal statement" in "a series of convictions" and by its meaning. It purposes to be an exposition of Glory. Two of its chapter headings are "The Mystery of Pardon and the Paradox of Vanity" and "The Theology of Romantic Love", the latter a study of Dante. There is, no doubt, a thread running through, and we reach the City in the last chapter; but we trust Heaven is not like this!

Mrs. A. M. Wilkinson has followed her admirable little book, *Facing Life,* with a worthy sequel, **Followers All* (Livingstone Press, 1s.), which she calls "A Book about Leadership". After looking at leadership in the world today, she examines the lives of leaders, among whom she includes Socrates, Mussolini, Madame Chiang Kai-Shek, and Bishop Azariah. Then we come to Jesus, and His leadership in the modern world. This bare sketch fails to indicate the liveliness of the chapters, which may be illustrated from one of the questions offered for discussion:

> If you were given £1,000 to invest in one down-and-out family (father on the dole for past five years, mother a household drudge, six children under ten) how would you spend it? How much can money do for these people?

Still another Masaryk book and this time a good one! In *Masaryk on Thought and Life* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) we have conversations with Karel Capek, the author being merely the philosopher-statesman's whetstone as he discusses religion, culture, politics, democracy, the relation of Church and State, *etc.* There is something anticipatory of General Smuts's "holism" in Masaryk's "concretism", which

> recognizes not only true reason, but also the senses, the feelings and the will taken altogether, the whole experience of our consciousness . . . the all is for me a harmonious system.

His faith he expresses in the words:

> Jesusdom, love of one's neighbour, an effective love, reverence before God.

The scattered *obiter dicta* are often stimulating:

> I have read the most important so-called biographies of Jesus; in none of them do I find so much religious life as in the Gospels. The Gospels have the very smell of reality.
>
> During the life of Jesus and for quite a long time afterwards the believers and followers only congregated in free corporations—these were the apostolic times; only later was the church systematically organized.
>
> The more order in the world is secularized, the more the churches could and should dedicate themselves to a pure and immaculate

religion—to Jesus' religion; to make the world truly Christian, not through power but through love.

A stirring book, giving us glimpses into the mind of one of the greatest men of our times. If Greek and Latin tags are passed on, translators should see they are accurate.

Did Dr. W. P. Paterson not reveal that the writer of Prof. T. S. K. Scott-Craig's *Christian Attitudes to War and Peace* (Oliver & Boyd, 6s.) was a Scot, the use of "will" for "shall" would do so. Prof. Scott-Craig has moved from absolute pacifism to a belief that the immediate task for the Christian is to work for a truly international court and an effective international police-army to administer international law. The value of the book—and it is valuable—lies not so much in the personal witness as in the exposition of four Christian attitudes—those of "Jesus and the Ethic of Love", "Augustine and the Temporal Order", "Luther and Human Sinfulness", and "Grotius and the Coming of Reason". In his "Conclusion" the author glances at "Current Christian Attitudes"—Synopticism (Cadoux, Heering, Macgregor), Catholicism (Vanderpol, Stratmann), Evangelicalism (Heim, Brunner, Althaus), and Liberalism (Boeckel, Leyton Richards).

Eight medical men contribute to *The Doctor's View of War* (Allen & Unwin, 3s. 6d.) edited by Dr. H. Joules. They discuss the diseases of war, including shell-shock; food and famine; and the relation of the doctor to the Army and the State, with a glance at the disregard of the Red Cross shown in recent warfare. Though not pacifists, they show themselves as supporters of the League of Nations, while Prof. J. A. Ryle in his Foreword goes so far as to speculate whether the medical profession could not prevent war if all its members were to decline to take any part in it. Readers will find many curious facts in this informing little book: how many people are aware that in 1500 B.C. it was known that inability to see at dusk could be cured by eating liver?

Mr. Kenneth Ingram's *The Christian Challenge to Christians* (Allen & Unwin, 6s.) is a sequel to his *Christianity—Right or Left?* Mr. Ingram writes with passionate indignation about the treatment of the unemployed, but his book is essentially an appeal to reason. Though sometimes unconvincing, as in his references to Ananias, Mr. Ingram presents a strong case for his contention that "Christianity demands economic change and the political action necessary to bring about this change, or it is impotent. There is no separate spiritual realm." The majority of the people turn from the churches with indifference or contempt; they feel the values which the churches insist upon as vital are irrelevant to real life. Those who remain loyal to organized religion are middle-aged and elderly people, the conservative and uncritically minded, "while the mentally adventurous, the critically intelligent, progressive thinkers are almost to a man outside". Younger men and women can hardly conceive the possibility of a Christianity which has any relevance to the world situation. Christianity must stand for the extension of the democratic principles to the economic field, or these principles will disappear from the political field. Christians must rid themselves of a hampering dualism and see the teachings of Christ triumphant in a world of economic freedom where private profit is eliminated.

Dr. C. W. J. Brasher's *Faith Healing* (Duckworth, 5s.) is not a good book, though it furnishes some valuable case-histories, notably of healings at Lourdes, and is no doubt right in its thesis that "Spiritual healing is a well-authenticated fact which demands careful and reverent investigation".

There is a good deal of repetition, and of matter the relevance of which is not obvious; while it may be true that "many modern scientists have abandoned the self-confident materialism of an earlier age", we doubt if the kind of faith Dr. Brasher desiderates and believes to be gaining ground has any ultimate value. We wish he had given more attention to the question "Faith in what?" We doubt if auto-suggestion and kindred topics find any mention at all in his pages. And if one wishes to show an acquaintance with Greek it would be well to get the breathings correct.

All ministers of religion should have on their shelves as a book of reference *Mental Deficiency* (Watts, 2s. 6d.), by Mr. J. Duncan, the Headmaster of a Special (M.D.) School. Mr. Duncan provides a well-documented and thorough sketch of the nature and extent of mental deficiency in children and adults, and shows how the problem of the education of the feeble-minded and the intellectually dull is being tackled. There is also a balanced statement of the case for and against sterilization. Mr. Duncan pays considerable attention to Dr. R. B. Cattell's contention that at present the decline in mean intelligence for the whole population of this country is three per cent every thirty years. Without frightening ourselves with the appalling distant prospect this calls before us—of half the population mentally defective 300 years hence—we should do well to face the facts Dr. Cattell and Mr. Duncan present. Of the results of a survey in Hampshire Dr. Cattell remarks, with the Winchester figures specially in mind:

> An excess of low intelligence was almost invariably found in small towns of great age which had been important and prosperous in the Middle Ages. It is as if old cities, like old fires, accumulate much ash.

Does this apply in its measure to old countries too? It certainly seems as if the churches would do well to consider this problem rather than some of the barren topics which so frequently engage their attention.

Dr. Cattell's **Crooked Personalities in Childhood and After* (Nisbet, 7s. 6d.), the new volume in the "Contemporary Library of Psychology", is described as "An Introduction to Psychotherapy". Despite the undue fondness for technical terms which still marks the psychologists, it is an admirable introduction: the early chapters, describing the work of Freud, Jung, and Adler, are exceptionally well done. Dr. Cattell was for some years psychotherapist in the Leicester School Psychological Clinic, the first clinic of its kind to be established in England, and the case-histories he quotes are of great value. The chapter on "Genius" does not seem to have much relation to the rest of the book, and we should have preferred the space to have been given to expansion of the section dealing with children, especially perhaps adolescent children, about whom Dr. Cattell has comparatively little to say. Is there such a word as "maladaption"?

Alfred Adler always seems to us the least remote from reality of the psychologists, and his *Social Interest: A Challenge to Mankind* (Faber, 10s. 6d.) is therefore very welcome. Its exposition of the "Individual Psychology" is untechnical, and will convince any doubter that Adler is right in holding that it is impossible to form a right estimate of an individual without knowledge of the structure of his life problems—especially of communal life, work, and love. The "inferiority complex" which Adler deems so important is due to "an imperfect preparation for co-operation", and this is best seen in the childhood of pampered children. Adler well says that

> the task of the educationist, the teacher, the physician, the pastor, is

> to increase the social feeling and thereby strengthen the courage of the individual. He does this by convincing him of the real causes of his failure, by disclosing the wrong meaning—the mistaken significance he has foisted on life . . .

The psychologists do not love each other, and we wish Adler did not deem it necessary to refer to Freud so often. The suggested questionnaire for individual psychologists in dealing with difficult children deserves attention. A word is misspelt on p. 113.

We fear that there would be some critics among the audience who were "still clapping as Dr. Hansell climbed down from the platform" at the end of Dr. E. F. Griffith's *Morals in the Melting Pot* (Gollancz, 5s.). Last quarter we reviewed another book on the subject by Dr. Griffith, which we think was much to be preferred to this one; here he employs the dialogue method, which can only be carried through successfully by a writer with a light touch (Dr. Griffith should ask his novelist patients about their difficulties with conversation). Of course, there is much sound teaching—and a good deal of information which will be new to many readers—in this book, as in the previous one, and Dr. Griffith carries us with him perhaps 80 per cent of the way. Not always; we shiver, *e.g.*, when he refers to George Fox as an "American Quaker", and wonder if Dr. Griffith is equally fallible elsewhere.

In *Sex, Friendship and Marriage* (Allen & Unwin, 6s.) Mr. K. C. Barnes and Miss G. Frances Barnes have given us an eminently sensible and practical book, and one which could be studied with advantage by all contemplating matrimony and by parents with young children. Although there has been a surfeit of books of this kind, this is not superfluous; the chapters on "Courtship and Engagement" and "The Upbringing of Children" are especially good.

Mr. R. Osborn's *The Psychology of Reaction* (Gollancz, 7s. 6d.) is another child of the marriage between Marx and Freud. It contains little that is new: first an account of the decay of a capitalist civilization of which fascism is the last phase; then an attempt to explain fascism and the dictators, and even Trotsky, on the lines of Freudian psychology. Once you accept Mr. Osborn's premisses you can see that his book is reasonable—but they are not so generally convincing as he seems to think, and the varieties of human character and behaviour are not to be explained on such simples lines as Freud—and Mr. Osborn—would have us believe.

Dr. Joan Evans has provided a very readable translation of the *Histoire de Saint Louis,* and many who are not specialists on the medieval period will read the vivid narrative of the *History of St. Louis* (Oxford Press, 8s. 6d.) with interest and be grateful for the notes, which are a model of conciseness.

If we want to learn about the Universities we shall, despite Mr. Nathan Schachner's *The Mediaeval Universities* (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.), still turn to Prof. Powicke's new edition of Rashdall's famous work, on which Mr. Schachner admits he "leans heavily"; but he himself is too colourful, too addicted to adjectives, to win our confidence—the swirling waters, the smoking wilderness, and the retired and repentant millionaires aroused our suspicions at once. The smart descriptions of the Crusades as "the leading outdoor sport of European chivalry" and of the "die-hard, stick-in-the-mud theology" of "that grim gaunt hound of orthodoxy, Bernard, saint-to-be" did not reassure us, nor did the spelling "Berenger". With all that, if a beginner be first warned, Mr. Schachner's volume might serve as a popular

introduction to the subject: he is at his best in his summaries of Nominalism, Realism, and the like, which undergraduates often find entirely incomprehensible.

A deep sense of gratitude for all the labour Miss C. H. Garrett has expended in compiling *The Marian Exiles* (Cambridge Press, 21s.), and for all the labour the book will save us in future days, cannot obliterate our regret that while she was about it she has not made her volume much more useful. Like the rest of research students, Miss Garrett is naturally inclined to exaggerate the importance of her discoveries—and her transcripts from continental archives are indeed of service—but there was much to her hand which might have been incorporated with advantage. Her census, with short biographies, of the exiles (she confirms Foxe's "well near 800"), almost invariably stops short with their careers in 1559. Had she used the immense pamphlet literature, or glanced at the names, say, at the head of one item in *A parte of a register,* she would have found much information suggestive to herself, and complementary to her census. Obviously she is unaware of all the work done on Robert Browne (whose name she gets wrong) and Robert Harrison, and she makes little if any use of lists of the early Separatists.

It is the biographies that are the valuable part of the book, for we are not impressed by the thesis Miss Garrett endeavours to establish. She considers the exile a deliberate attempt (backed by Cecil, Gardiner, and London bankers) to transfer overseas a "potential commonwealth"; the exiles were not "poor banished Englishmen" suffering for their religion; they were a well organized political, even seditious, community undertaking a temporary experiment in colonization, aristocratic in constitution, and with "a set plan and undeviating purpose". Once started, Miss Garrett gallops away; before the end we have not only a "ranking ecclesiastic", but a "protestant administrative committee" in London. It really will not do. That there was some organization between the exiles, that some among them had definite political views, is of course true. That they kept up what communication they could with London is also true. But they had not the American pre-occupation with machinery and procedure Miss Garrett suggests. All that being said, the census is packed with useful material (though not without mistakes), and it will be a great boon. Let Miss Garrett set to work to bring all her biographies up-to-date, and our thanks shall be boundless.

Mr. Brian Magee's *The English Recusants* (Burns, Oates, 10s. 6d.) is a study of "the state of Popery in England" from 1588 to the 18th century. The facts he has accumulated are much more impressive than the rhetoric of Mr. Hilaire Belloc's Introduction, but it is surprising that both spent so much time discussing the number of Catholics in Elizabethan England when Macaulay had said the last word, had they known it. Quoting Cardinal Bentivoglio, he wrote:

> The zealous Catholics he reckoned at 1/30 part of the nation. The people who would, without the least scruple become Catholics if the Catholic religion were established, he estimated at 4/5 of the nation . . . the people whose minds were made up on either side, who were inclined to make any sacrifice or run any risk for either religion, were very few. Each side had a few enterprising champions, and a few stout-hearted martyrs; but the nation, undetermined in its opinions and feelings, resigned itself implicitly to the guidance of the government, and lent to the sovereign for the time being an equally ready aid against either of the extreme parties.

Mr. Magee rightly sees in the defeat of the Armada and in the Gunpowder Plot "turning points in the disintegration of the Catholic tradition". He is specially valuable in his discussion of the extent of the imposition of recusancy fines, and of the system of farming them which meant that comparatively little of them reached the Exchequer. He estimates the Catholics at 1/10 of the population in the reigns of Charles I and Charles II, but after 1685 they declined rapidly until in 1781 they were only 70,000, or one per cent of the population.

Anyone desiring to write of Roger Bacon must walk in thick darkness, in which facts can be but dimly discerned. Such facts as there are are collected in Mr. F. W. Woodruff's *Roger Bacon* (Clarke, 5s.), a welcome, if slight, little volume. One of the great "ifs" of history is what later discoveries might have been anticipated had Clement IV lived; protected by him Bacon might have revealed much that he kept concealed. Speculation here is fruitless, but it is good to be reminded of the pioneer of experimental science, who, while of his thirteenth century period, yet pointed the way to the future.

Canon C. L. Hulbert-Powell has rendered a fine and long needed service to learning in his *John James Wettstein* (1693-1754) (S.P.C.K., 12s. 6d.), and one that is specially opportune in view of the new edition of Wettstein's text and commentary now being prepared by German scholars. Theological students often find textual criticism boring, but once the first steps have been mastered, it is fascinating indeed; no figure in its entrancing story is more important than Wettstein, whom Canon Hulbert-Powell aptly compares with Robertson Smith. The period between the publication of his *Prolegomena* in 1730 and his *Greek Testament* in 1752 was filled with strenuous work. At Basel his pioneering work brought him into conflict with the narrow-minded and conservative scholars of the Reformed Church, but he found refuge with the Remonstrants in Amsterdam. His violence and lack of self-control in controversy are to be regretted, and he proved his own worst enemy. The defects in his character sink into insignificance by the side of the greatness of his achievements. We are grateful to Canon Hulbert-Powell for a fine and scholarly piece of work.

A book like Mr. Maurice Whitlow's *J. Taylor-Smith, Everybody's Bishop* (R.T.S., 2s. 6d.) presents a problem and a challenge. The late Chaplain-General to the Forces had neither great intellectual gifts nor prolonged training, yet at Sierra Leone, in the Army, and in multifarious activities after he left the Army, he impressed men and women. His methods were those many—most—people could not follow; he never hesitated to talk to people in trains, on park benches, in royal palaces, about their souls; he believed that he was guided in all the details of his life. If he missed a train it was because God had some work for him to do on the next one or in the interval of waiting. A familiar and popular figure at Keswick, he was representative of the Keswick movement at its best. Was his power the result of the intensity of his faith, the more intense because it was narrow? Have Modernists and those who feel his methods to be impossible and mistaken found a better way to win people for Christ? There lies the challenge of a life like Bishop Taylor-Smith's.

Mr. T. Bentley Duncan's *A Missionary Arrives in Brazil* (Pickering & Inglis, 2s. 6d.) leaves us with exactly the same impression. It tells of five years' successful missionary work in Jonzeiro in Brazil, in a place where no Protestant missionary had worked and where Roman Catholicism was found at about its worst. The intensity of Mr. and Mrs. Duncan's faith

and the sacrificial nature of their witness resulted in the building up of a Christian community, now in charge of one of Mr. Duncan's converts, once a violent opponent of his work. The reader will be as impressed as were the people of Jonzeiro, but he will ask whether this fundamentalist theology and this mechanical view of Scripture, of prayer, and of guidance, can produce permanent results. Mr. Duncan calls the finding of a house "a good day's work" and gives credit to "the Lord" and a group of praying friends in Glasgow. Houses were hard to get and this particular one had been promised to another man, who said he would let the missionary have it, but after a week changed his mind. Mr. Duncan stuck to the house, for "the Lord had given us a good house in a desirable locality". What the other party thought of the Lord and His servant does not appear.

Mrs. Cruse has followed up two fascinating books by *After the Victorians* (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.), which describes the reading of the English people from 1887 to 1914, interesting years which include the decadents, books from France and Russia, the feminists, the emergence of social questions, Kipling and his school, and crime books among their features. Mrs. Cruse is as readable as ever. There are a good many slips disfiguring the pages; to take two pages for example—p. 80 has E. E. *Kellet* (correct on p. 81) and *Bridge* for *Bridges* twice.

The parsons seem to be monopolizing interest among the diarists: recently we have met James Woodforde and William Cole, and now, in *Kilvert's Diary* (Cape, 12s. 6d.), Mr. William Plomer introduces us to Francis Kilvert, from whose journals he gives us extracts for the years 1870 and 1871 (to Aug. 19). At this time Kilvert, then 30 years old, was curate at Clyro in Breconshire. He reveals himself as a lover of nature and of children, and very susceptible to the beauty of little girls—of whom Gipsy Lizzie was a great favourite. He was susceptible to those who were older too, though he does speak of "young lady affectations, peculiarities, vagaries, *etc., etc.,* unintelligible". We do not get so much about meals as in Woodforde, though quite enough—"I ate so much hare that I could hardly walk and saw stars".

Tourists (unless it be dissenters—"Some barbarian—a dissenter no doubt, probably a Baptist") are his pet abomination, especially when they disturb his solitude—

> It is fine to be out on the hills alone. A man can hardly be a beast or a fool alone on a great mountain. There is no company like the grand solemn beautiful hills. They fascinate and grow upon us and one has a feeling of a love for them which one has for nothing else. I don't wonder that our Saviour went out into a mountain to pray and continued all night in praying to God *there*.

Generally restrained, he sometimes lets himself go—as when four large glasses of port, given him to cure face-ache, give him instead "a bursting, raging, splitting, sick headache", or when (20 Mar. 1871) he calls the Parisians

> the scum of the earth, and Paris is the crater of the volcano, France, and a bottomless pit of revolution and anarchy.

There is little reference to national and international affairs, though many interesting glimpses of social habits—a cold bath on Christmas day, with ice and sponge frozen hard, skating, penny readings, *etc.* Occasional *obiter dicta* break the rather monotonous entries of the daily round: "All evil things have always come from the East, the plague, cholera and

man''. While Kilvert is not in the first flight of diarists, we shall be glad to have further selections. The editing is good, though probably we have *Saultey* for *Santley* on p. 25.

We never tire of reading books about Gladstone, and it is significant that so many continue to be written. The latest—*Gladstone* (Allen & Unwin, 15s.)—is by a continental scholar, Dr. Erich Eyck, and a very good one it is. The author is an admirer of the ''G.O.M.'' and writes with sympathy throughout, but he has the objective outlook of the trained historian, and his biography never becomes panegyric. English as well as foreign readers will find the volume an admirable way of approach to the study of the Gladstonian period. Once again we are struck by Victoria's abominable treatment of Gladstone; it sometimes seems doubtful to us whether the monarchy would have survived her reign were it not for the fact that the monarch was a woman. Mr. Bernard Miall has translated with his usual efficiency; we doubt, however, whether there is an English word ''irrecusable'' (p. 62); certainly there is no ''abundent'' (p. 352).

Vol. II of Dr. G. P. Gooch's *Before the War* (Longmans, 10s.) deals with ''The Coming of the Storm'' and is packed with information from the Chancelleries of Europe in the years preceding 1914. There is necessarily a good deal of repetition, for the official careers of Grey, Poincaré, Bethmann Hollweg, Sazonoff, and Berchtold are studied in turn. As we read, we cannot but marvel that Europe escaped war for so long. And we cannot but be impressed by the power of the diplomats and their failure to play the game. To take but our own: we have Bertie in Paris going behind Grey's back (p. 125) and urging Poincaré and Cambon to move against the Foreign Secretary's attempted *rapprochement* with Germany, and Nicolson (p. 160) speaking of Asquith's ministry as a ''Radical Socialist Ministry'' which ''will not last long. It is at the end of its strength, and with the Conservatives you [he is speaking to Cambon] will be able to get something precise''.

By the publication of these two volumes Dr. Gooch has added to the debt which all students of international politics already owe him.

After reading Dr. Gooch it was with anticipation we turned to *The Life of Jules Cambon* (Cape, 15s.) by his niece, Madame Geneviève Tabouis. The translation is readable, though ''complicatedness'' is scarcely English. One of two brothers destined for fame in the world of diplomacy, Jules, after being Governor General of Algeria, was Ambassador in turn in Washington, Madrid, and Berlin, and then played an active part in the making of the Treaty of Versailles and its aftermath. He was a realist and a Frenchman (his biographer says the moderation of Foch's Armistice terms is well known!); no country could have had a better representative. He had little belief in leagues or in promises, and ''One doesn't charm Germany; one overawes her''. Of course, Cambon in this was but typical of the diplomatists; we have Sir Arthur Nicolson explaining that while it might be true the war might not have happened had England declared herself sooner, ''it would have been impossible to embark on it without the consent of the old maids and the parsons. It had needed the invasion of Belgium to decide them''.

Madame Tabouis gives us many unforgettable glimpses of the great figures of the War years; among them is Joffre interrupting congratulations on the day after the Marne with the words ''Do not congratulate me. It was Von Kluck who lost the battle, not I who won it''.

Mme. Tabouis emphasizes the evidence which shows that Germany was for long preparing for war. A successful biography which paints a revealing picture of the pre-War years.

In *The Struggle for Religious Freedom in Germany* (Gollancz, 8s. 6d.) the Dean of Chichester has given us a very useful and timely book to which all who want a survey of the quarrel between Church and State in Germany during the last five years will frequently turn. The book is well documented, the appendixes including Dr. Niemöller's sermon (27th June, 1937), the Concordat between the Holy See and the German Government, the Pope's Encyclical, Minister Kerrl's speech of February, 1937, and Dr. Otto Dibelius's Open Letter in reply. It is difficult to restrain one's indignation when thinking of the treatment of Christians and Jews in Germany, but we wish the Dean had done so in his book and remained entirely objective; it would be regrettable if "egregious" and "typical example of Nazi bad manners" prevented the narrative from receiving the consideration to which it is entitled.

Dr. Arthur Frey's *Cross and Swastika* (S.C.M., 6s.), now translated from the German, covers much of the same ground as the Dean of Chichester's book, though it concerns the Confessional Church only; indeed, Dr. Frey makes a good point when he says that in the early days many Protestants joined the National Socialist Movement because they hoped it would check the growth of political Roman Catholicism. Dr. Frey, who is a Swiss political economist and a disciple of Karl Barth, gives succinct accounts of the various parties in the German Church; Englishmen who knew Hauer in Oxford will read with special interest the chapter on "The German Vision of God". Barth writes a long, vigorous, and characteristic Preface in which he is less than fair in saying that the Churches in the victorious Powers never raised a word of protest against the Versailles Treaty; certainly many individuals in the Churches did! The translator well sums up the situation in the words:

> With diabolical ingenuity and under cover of legality (laws never intended to apply to the Church being pressed into service) a campaign of suppression is being carried on—so successfully that it is confidently felt that little else remains to be done, and that it is only a matter of time till the Church will disappear. The young people have been secured, the machinery has been captured, the old confirmed Christians can be allowed to die off and the new generation will grow up apart from the alien influence of the Christian religion.

While it was a relief to hear Sir Edward Grigg's measured tones in the *Observer* rather than Mr. Garvin's hysteria, the policy now set forth in the former's *Britain Looks at Germany* (Nicholson & Watson, 5s.) is the same policy. To Sir Edward the first need is a Register for Home Defence (which, he naïvely thinks, will convince the Dictators that Britain is in earnest and not decadent), and the second a compulsory three months' training (not military) for all youths between the ages of 18 and 20. Sir Edward has some strange notions; he thinks, for example (p. 266), that the air is composed of oxygen and hydrogen, and some of his political conceptions are equally wide of the mark. Never for a minute does he suggest the possibility that Hitler dare not go to war because of the insecurity of his position; apparently he considers that the Führer has won the millions of Socialists and Communists so active up to 1933. And he maintains a prudent silence about Spain.

Mr. H. J. Timperley, the *Manchester Guardian* correspondent in China, was prevented from reporting Japanese outrages in Nanking last December. In *What War Means: the Japanese Terror in China* (Gollancz, 7s. 6d.) he presents a documentary record, including eye-witness accounts, which nobody lacking a strong stomach should read. If the Japanese military authorities are in control of Japan, it is clear that they are not in control of the soldiery; wholesale murder, rape, and looting were common. Other parts of the book tell of the terror in North China, of the indiscriminate slaughter of civilians, and of the systematic removal of every trace of metal in Shanghai so that it is impossible for many works to restart. Some day a terrible Nemesis will fall on Japan; one wonders who will suffer most in the long run—the Chinese men, women, and children who are the victims, or those whose lust and greed make them less than human.

It is a pity we could not have had Professor E. Allison Peers's *Our Debt to Spain* (Burns, Oates, 5s.) without the perfervid defence of the Spanish insurgents in the Introduction. So much is heard about the decadence of Spain that it is well we should be reminded of her great contribution to civilization in centuries past. To this contribution *Our Debt to Spain* is a handbook, with its outstanding chapter that on "Reconquered Spain" and its mystics.

Elsewhere in this issue we have referred to "Coleridge at his worst". In *The Political Thought of Samuel Taylor Coleridge* (Cape, 8s. 6d.) Mr. R. J. White has skilfully skimmed off the best, and not only students of political philosophy will praise him for saving them from arduous labour. In three sections, "Youth", "Growth", "Maturity", Mr. White presents selections arranged under "Religion", "Philosophy", "Politics", "His Own Times". Coleridge says the English Church was "blighted with prudence": we fear that now this applies to all the Churches, even those labelled "Free".

In these days of dictatorship and bureaucracy there is so much need of vigilance that any book which displays alertness is to be welcomed. And there is so much in the learned Judge's gibe, "Justice in this country is just like the Ritz Hotel. It's open to rich and poor alike", that any writer who points out how the scales are weighted against the unpopular, the once convicted, the prostitute, the ill-clad, the communist, deserves commendation. But Mr. James Curtis's *The Land of Liberty* (Secker, 3s. 6d.) spoils a good case by exaggeration and violence. Thousands of working men in Lancashire and Yorkshire will smile as they read of their downtrodden condition and their fear of the police. It is not correct to say that no member of the proletariat has become a barrister, *etc., etc.* Let Mr. Curtis stick to the bare facts, and keep his eyes open for any imposition on the poor and any infringement of the law by police or magistrate: then he will serve the cause he has at heart.

Mr. J. A. Hobson, who has just celebrated his 80th birthday, has won the respect of all and not least of those who have opposed the economic heresies of which he writes in *Confessions of an Economic Heretic* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.). Mr. Hobson describes the individuals who and the events which have influenced him during his long life and relates his heresies from his first book on over-saving. To this heresy he still adheres, though now it forms part of his belief that cyclic depressions are due to under-production caused by an under-consumption resulting from the mal-distribution of national income. Often as we read we pause at a pregnant phrase—Den-

mark, "perhaps the most civilized country in the world"; "psychology should make every man his own humorist". Mr. Hobson shed his religious beliefs in his youth, and it is clear he is unacquainted with modern apologetic for Christianity.

During years when there has been little that is inspiring about our politics one of the few encouraging features has been the activity of the group of Conservatives of whom Mr. Harold Macmillan is the best-known. In *The Middle Way* (Macmillan, 5s.—an amazingly low price for a book of nearly 400 pp.)—Mr. Macmillan argues that between fascism and communism a middle way must be found by planning, and the democratic system vindicate itself by showing that freedom and efficiency can be combined. He believes that the theories of free Capitalism and State Socialism are remote from the practical needs of today, but that the problems of industry and commerce can be solved by raising the standard of life. To this end he would have a National Economic Council, which would survey all economic activity and co-ordinate the activities of the Central Bank, the National Investment Board, the Foreign Trade organizations, and the Industrial Advisory Council. We cannot in this notice expound Mr. Macmillan's scheme, which includes a minimum wage—and unemployment benefit—equal to Mr. Seebohm Rowntree's minimum income for a family of five (53s. a week, now 55s.), but we warmly commend the book as an able effort to state the case for a planned economy as the solution of the country's problems.

We have read with interest and pleasure Miss Anne Holt's history of Ullet Road Church, Liverpool, now celebrating its 250th anniversary, published under the title *Walking Together* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.). Liverpool Unitarianism has produced some fine characters, and many of them received their inspiration in the church now represented by Ullet Road. Miss Holt's book is much more than the history of a single church; the local history is set against a spacious background. Miss Holt and Dr. McLachlan are doing much to fill the gap left by the death of Alexander Gordon, and we trust that the lady, now the Editor of the *Unitarian Historical Society Transactions*, will give us many more works. We hope she will resist the temptation to comment—there is what might almost be called a gibe on p. 198 which would be better omitted in a scientific history. "Colley" on p. 64 looks strange to a Yorkshireman; it is correct in the very useful bibliography.

The Master of the Impossible (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.) consists of sayings Miss C. E. Padwick has selected from the letters and journals of Lilias Trotter, who from 1888 to her death in 1928 gave her talents and her life to Christian service in Algiers. Mostly in parable form, the selections reveal a choice spirit with a love for Nature and Nature's God, an intimate knowledge of the Bible, and a passion for the people whom she yearned to win for her Lord.

In *Gathered Harvest* (Rich & Cowan, 3s. 6d.) Mr. David Williamson gives us gleanings from his reading over many years. Quotations in poetry and prose are interspersed with stories selected with a view to their use as illustrations by speakers.

Two more volumes in Mr. S. A. Clark's handy and useful "£10 series" (Nicholson & Watson, 5s. each) are *Austria on £10* and *Finland on £10*. Mr. Clark was unfortunate in that Germany swallowed Austria after his book was in type, and some of it is already obsolete. Finland has attracted many British visitors in recent years and those following in their steps will be grateful for Mr. Clark's guidance.

Few series have kept up so excellent a standard and been so uniformly useful as Mr. W. E. Doubleday's "Practical Library Handbooks". *Public Library Finance* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.) should be studied by all in any way concerned with the administration of public libraries.

Mrs. Virginia Woolf has done nothing better than the sustained satire of *Three Guineas* (Hogarth Press, 7s. 6d.), in which she replies to appeals for subscriptions from (1) a society for the prevention of war and the preservation of civil liberties, (2) a women's college, (3) a society for obtaining employment for professional women. Mrs. Woolf places her darts exactly where she wants them, on the most vulnerable and sensitive spots. And let no reader omit the notes, for there she is superb. Altogether an effective volume, which it is to be hoped men will read, and not least churchmen.

Mr. Verrier Elwin's work among the Gonds is familiar to all who know India. In his second novel, *A Cloud That's Dragonish* (Murray, 7s. 6d.), he makes a thriller out of life among these primitive people, who believe in witchcraft, and never assign a natural reason if a supernatural can be found. Many traditional stories are woven into the narrative, which holds the reader, though sometimes he finds the relationship of the characters bewildering.

Mr. Eric Linklater has obviously enjoyed himself hugely in writing *The Impregnable Women* (Cape, 7s. 6d.), and even those who know nothing of the Aristophanic inspiration will enjoy his rollicking pages. In the nineteen-forties France suddenly launches an air attack on London; soon London is in ruins and Europe is at war. The war drags on until at last women conceive the idea of ending it by a "love-strike". It would be unkind to the reader to reveal the outcome. Behind Mr. Linklater's irony—and the book is very clever—there is serious purpose. Is it not true that if the women of the world so determined wars would be no more?

Mr. J. B. Priestley has donned the robes of Mr. John Buchan and "Sapper" and given us a delectable thriller, *The Doomsday Men* (Heinemann, 7s. 6d.). The technique of the earlier chapters is that of *The Good Companions,* the characters to be gathered together in the *dénouement* being seen in spheres far apart. The book, indeed, is one of the best things Mr. Priestley has done since *The Good Companions* : nothing like so good as that work, for there is no Jess Oakroyd, and coincidence is strained till it creaks. But the book took two midnight hours which should have gone to other work, and that is a good testimonial. Mr. Priestley's life on his Arizona ranch has stood him in good stead, and in his portrayal of scenes and episodes he is as photographically accurate as ever. This adventure in a new *genre* leaves us wondering where he will break out next!

The *Joyful Delaneys* (Macmillan, 8s. 6d.) is in some ways the best book Sir Hugh Walpole has written. Certainly there is no finer characterization of old people to be found in any of his books, and the picture of genteel poverty is terrifying in its vividness. Once more Sir Hugh makes a house the dominating feature of his story, and most readers will rejoice that the Delaneys and their house are not put asunder. Sex plays a large part in the book, but Sir Hugh would probably reply that sex plays a large part in life. The Delaneys are a likeable family, all four of them; we cannot but ask, however, why one particular liaison of Fred's should be more significant than all the others. All the characters are good; Brocket evidently "had it coming to him" from the beginning; we are sorry Cæsar let him off so lightly.

A play should speak for itself, and not need much by way of Introduction: Mr. Arnold Freeman does no service to his *Saint Paul* (Bodley Head, 3s. 6d. & 2s.) by prefixing a page from Rudolf Steiner, a Foreword by Mr. Rom Landau, and a Preface of 20 pages by himself. Unlike Mr. Freeman, we should like to see a film of the Life of St. Paul, and rejoice to know that the Religious Film Society has one in preparation. Mr. Freeman's play has 14 scenes, some of them very short; it does not read to us as though it would be effective for either those familiar with the New Testament or those unacquainted with it, but Mr. Freeman's cast at the Little Theatre of the Sheffield Educational Settlement may have "put it across".

Everything the veteran teacher, Dr. W. Adams Brown, has to say is worth reading, and therefore a warm welcome awaits *The Minister: His World and His Work* (Clark, 7s.) even though some of the papers collected in it seem rather out-of-date, and but re-echo what Dr. Brown has said in other works. The title does not indicate the scope of the book, as some of the chapter-heads will reveal—"What the World has a right to Expect from the Church"; "The Scientist's Substitute for God: Nature"; "The Humanist's Substitute for God: Man" (a very good chapter this). The last five chapters deal with the minister as priest, evangelist, teacher, pastor, and churchman, and few ministers there be who could not learn something from them.

M. André Maurois's *The Thought Reading Machine* (Cape, 5s.) is just the book for a train journey or an evening after dinner. Get a Frenchman of M. Maurois's wit and subtlety describing what happens when an English scientist in an American University invents a thought-reading machine, and the possibilities are boundless. It would be unfair to explain what happens—as the jacket unfortunately does; readers will enjoy both the development of the story and the satire of the writer. Attention is needed to misspellings on pages 32, 160, and 161, and to "have a state for hypotheses" is not English.

It is perhaps due to the fact that we can find not an atom of interest in the romances of *Cyrus* and *Clélie* that were such a rage in their day that we found the first part of Miss Dorothy McDougall's *Madeleine de Scudéry* such heavy going. Perhaps, too, we were unduly disturbed by such spellings as "leven" and "Jane Austin", and by wondering if Dorothy Osborne's description of Madeleine as living in her brother's house "as Mayde" did mean as maid-servant and merely as unmarried. When Georges falls into the background and the friendship with Pellisson begins, the book starts to live, for as historian of Louis XIV and as defender of the faith Pellisson moved at the heart of things. Madeleine (1607-1701) was one of those women who could write without ceasing; and she was indomitable, too, for to her death in her 94th year she maintained her interest in life. And that she counted may be judged not merely from the huge circulation of her romances but from the fact that when Bishop Mascaron had to pronounce the funeral oration on Turenne he wrote asking if she would "consider a little what you yourself would say if you were charged with such a mission".

EDITOR.

Students of the Gospels, whether beginners or advanced, will find in Mr. Allan Barr's four-coloured *Diagram of Synoptic Relationships* (Clark, 4s.) a very valuable aid. It should be used side by side with Huck's indispensable *Synopse*. Mr. Barr (who is Professor of *N.T.* Studies in the Edinburgh College which serves both the Congregationalists and the

United Free Church) wins his spurs with this most painstaking achievement. The diagram is prefaced by a concise and lucid survey of the Synoptic problem.

A convenient Introduction to *N.T.* from the Roman standpoint is provided by the papers read at a Cambridge Summer School in 1937, and published as *The New Testament* (Burns, Oates, 7s. 6d.). After two chapters on the Roman and Jewish backgrounds, Peter (by Mgr. Knox) has the place of honour. Paul gets 16 pages out of 344, but Fr. Martindale's character sketch is one of the happiest chapters in the book. Fr. Lattey deals with the Synoptic Gospels, and opposes the current critical solutions of the problem. Two lectures are devoted to *John,* and amongst other subjects discussed are Text, Canon, and Versions, the Parables, *N.T.* Apocrypha. The book represents the reaction of the Roman church to the quatercentenary celebration of the English "Open Bible", and Fr. Lattey in his preface claims that "the Catholic church is not only the one reliable champion of the authority of the Bible in this country, but also of its truth". At the end is a reprint of a *Times* leader on Wm. Tyndale, which while praising the translator's literary genius, pillories his acerbity and rancour—while discreetly silent on the rancour and acerbity of Thomas More. On p. 322 we are told that in *John* 13^2 we read in the English version "when supper was done"; Dr. Morgan, who supplies the true translation, "during supper", does not seem familiar with the *R.V.*

The Augustinians are the oldest religious order in the Roman communion. They derive from early hermitages founded by the great bishop of Hippo, and, having suffered heavily under the Vandals and Moors in their native North Africa, became diffused *via* Spain throughout Europe, and experienced many vicissitudes till they were brought together under Lanfranc Septala in 1256. The Very Rev. E. A. Foran in *The Augustinians* (Burns, Oates, 7s. 6d.) tells the story of these 800 years with unrivalled knowledge, and also supplies the first English translation of Possidius's life of the founder. There is much in this volume to interest and instruct others than those for whom it may primarily be intended.

ALEX. J. GRIEVE.

Prof. Herbert Schneider's *Meditations in Season* (Oxford Press, 6s. 6d.) covers much of the ground of Christian belief in short essays or meditations planned for the Christian year. These thoughtful and carefully written papers justify their claim to be meditations "on the elements of Christian philosophy"; they are more than usually interesting as being the work of a layman. The book is written with understanding and with an appreciation of the realities of the faith; it will be helpful as a cultured interpretation of modern trends of thought. But surely 6s. 6d. is rather a high price for a book of only 83 pages.

The Religion of the Good Life by R. P. Masani (Allen & Unwin, 6s.) is a popular account of Zoroastrianism. The first part deals with the beliefs and the second part with the ritual. Mr. Masani writes clearly; his book will be very useful to students and to many others who wish to have in a compact form the facts about this ancient religion.

Mr. Wendell Thomas's *A Democratic Philosophy* (Correlated Enterprises, $1.50) contains brief studies of John Dewey, Karl Marx, and the Hindu philosopher Sankara. In each case an account is given of the man and of his message, with an estimate of his teaching. In a final chapter

an attempt is made to bring their teachings into one view. The book is necessarily slight and there is room for wide difference of opinion about the "democratic synthesis".

In his latest book, *More Difficulties of the Evolution Theory* (Thynne, 8s. 6d.), Mr. Douglas Dewar continues his controversy with Dr. Morley Davies. Mr Dewar knows what there is to be said against the early Darwinian form of the evolution doctrine and he is a tireless controversialist. His book would be more useful if it were not so plainly written in the interests of a doctrine of "special creation", and if it were less occupied with making debating society points. As a tilt at some forms of dogmatic science the book has ability. Why does not Mr. Dewar leave Dr. Morley Davies alone and give us something constructive of his own?

Dr. David Watson's *Scientists are Human* (Watts, 7s. 6d.) is so obviously a frontal attack on the self-confidence of scientists who claim infallibility for their methods and results that one wonders if this is really the best way of dealing with them. It is a good thing that scientists should be reminded that they are but mortal men, subject to the same failures and passions as the rest of us. The truth is there is a danger of cant in the free use to-day of the term "scientific". Those who know most of the history of science will be least likely to have illusions about it. In most of this Dr. Watson is on fairly safe ground. It has to be admitted that scientists are often most trying; but even so one may be too combative; that is the fault of the first half of this book. The latter half is a considered account of the relation of science to the rest of our mental life. This will repay careful reading. Much that Dr. Watson says about the tyranny of specialization needs to be said again and again. The average scientist too often shuts himself up in his own narrowed field, and only too frequently is the least well educated among educated men. When Dr. Watson has let off all his squibs there remains a good deal of solid worth in what he has written.

Dr. R. W. Church's *An Essay on Critical Appreciation* (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.), for the most part a philosophical study in Aesthetics and concerned with the conditions of a sound critical appreciation of Art, needs an expert in the subject to review it. In the middle chapters Dr. Church writes of a painter's materials and technique; here he is illustrative and very interesting and carries the reader with him. The philosophical chapters are full of refinements to a degree which becomes confusing unless one is versed in the points of aesthetic theory. I am not quite sure what Dr. Church means to say that beauty is; or whether he means that there is no such thing as beauty in itself, as a quality, or whatever else it may be, that inheres in beautiful things, and that they have in common. His point seems to be that beauty always depends on a context. But suppose you take the lines of Coleridge,

> The moving Moon went up the sky,
>
> . . . .
>
> And a star or two beside,

beautiful lines, with what seems to me a quality of their own; not one imparted or created by any context, but beautiful in themselves, and perhaps the reflection of a very beautiful mind, and of the beauty that is in the night sky; well, when I try to apply Dr. Church's critical principles in this case they seem to me to miss the very thing which gives the poem life. Of course I am speaking of literary beauty; but the beauty of a poem and

of a picture do seem after all to have something in common, something which is the beauty we all wonder at and can never quite explain. I am afraid all this will seem very amateur to Dr. Church; but at any rate I have enjoyed his book.

A. T. S. JAMES.

NEW EDITIONS, REPRINTS, *ETC.*

New and welcome additions to the "World's Classics" (Oxford Press, 2s.) are Trollope's *The Prime Minister* (2 vols.), his *The Duke's Children* (2 vols.), Sir Hugh Walpole's *Prelude to Adventure,* which "fell entirely flat", though its author thought it "as unusual and remarkable a book as any young man ever wrote", Mr. Compton Mackenzie's *Guy and Pauline,* and Douglas's *The House with the Green Shutters,* introduced by Mr. Somerset Maugham, who considers all the writings of the "Kailyard School" dead, and would be surprised if he knew how much they are still read. Mr. J. A. Hobson, who has just celebrated his 80th birthday, has issued a third edition of his *Imperialism* (Allen & Unwin, 8s. 6d.), first published in 1902. This edition has been entirely revised, and a new introduction added. Mr. Stephen Spender's *The Destructive Element,* in which he discusses, in the main, Henry James and T. S. Eliot, now appears in Cape's "Life and Letters" series (4s. 6d.). New volumes of "Everyman's Library" (Dent, 2s.) are always welcome. *Twenty One-Act Plays* is specially good value; among those selected are plays by Lady Gregory, Stanley Houghton, Harold Brighouse, Lord Dunsany, Mr. St. John Ervine, Mr. Laurence Housman, Mr. Jas. Bridie, and Mr. Noel Coward. Many English readers will be glad to have also Stendhal's *Scarlet and Black* in the same series (two vols.). *The Substitute Guest,* by that indefatigable story writer, Mrs. G. L. Hill, has gone to a second impression (Lippincott, 7s. 6d.). We are glad to see a cheap edition of Mr. J. S. Hoyland's *Indian Dawn* (Heffer, 2s. 6d.).

LECTURES, PAMPHLETS, *ETC.*

This quarter has seen an unusual number of very good pamphlets. Among them is Dr. C. H. Valentine's *Psychology and Modern Life* (S.C.M., 1s. 6d.), lunch-hour addresses in a City church. The studies of Mr. Baulked-Ambition, Mr. Quickly-Hurt, and Miss Much-Afraid are excellent, the chapter on "Making the Best of Marriage" nothing like so good. Dr. Adolf Keller's *Five Minutes to Twelve* (S.C.M., 2s.) is the best interpretation of the Oxford and Edinburgh Conferences we have seen, though it has some strange attributions—the Bible, we learn, tells us we are not "such stuff as dreams are made on", and a *British* King said, "We fought at Arques, and you were not there!" ! The Rev. J. H. Weatherall's *The Significance of the Unitarians* (Lindsey Press, 1s.) is the Essex Hall Lecture. Mr. Weatherall argues that the doctrine of the Trinity is the "abiding obstacle to reunion", but that Unitarianism opens the way "to a higher stage in the evolution of Christianity which will heal the present rivalry of churches, classes, races, and nations". Lord Horder's *Obscurantism* (Conway Memorial Lecture, Watts, 2s.) is admirable and well deserves reading. The Swarthmore Lecture for 1938 is *Democratic Leadership* (Allen & Unwin, 2s. 6d. & 1s. 6d.), a timely pronouncement by Mr. A. Barratt Brown, Principal of Ruskin College. Mr. Joseph McCabe's *The Passing of Heaven and Hell* (Watts, 1s.), "a criticism of the Church of England Report on Doctrine", is too biased and too bitter to be of any permanent value. Mrs. Dorothy Hogg's *Challenge of the East* (S.P.C.K.,

3s. 6d. & 2s. 6d.) contains eighteen vivid and moving accounts of Christian enterprise in Japan, China, and India.

Prof. Claude Jenkins's *Frederick Denison Maurice and the New Reformation* (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.), the Maurice lecture for 1938, deals with "Maurice and Theology", "Maurice and Socialism", "Maurice and Education".

ALSO RECEIVED.

GEORGE GOODMAN. *Seventy Less-known Bible Stories.* Pickering & Inglis. 3s.
A. F. WINNINGTON-INGRAM. *What a layman should believe.* Longmans. 3s. 6d.
W. J. WRAY. *Jesus and the Common Man.* Stockwell. 2s. 6d.
F. A. TATFORD. *Christian Life in Practice Today.* Pickering. 2s. 6d.
J. M. MACDOUGALL FERGUSON. *Tyndale: Opener of a Door of Light.* Indep. Press. 8d.
BASIL MATHEWS. *Yarns on Fighters of India's Foes.* Livingstone Press. 1s.
MARY ENTWISTLE. *Sina's Marriage;* IRIS CORBIN. *Wong's Life.* Livingstone Press. 6d. each.
C. M. BEADNELL. *A Dictionary of Scientific Terms.* Watts. 1s.
C. A. PUNCKER. *Seeing London with My Young Friends.* Pickering & Inglis. 2s
M. E. MARKHAM. *Little Saint Barbara.* Pickering & Inglis. 1s.
GRACE LIVINGSTON HILL. *Sunrise.* Lippincott. 7s. 6d.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS.

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review (July). An interesting article by Mr. E. E. Kellett on "Macaulay's History" is followed by a challenge to Methodism by the Rev. P. J. Boyling. Readers of Mr. Manning's article in this issue will note Dr. Henry Bett's "Some Latinisms in the Wesleys' Hymns". The Rev. J. C. Hardwick's "The Anti-Liberal Reaction: What Next?" is very suggestive.

Hibbert Journal (July). Prof. Ernest Barker opens with "Natural Law in the Political World" and Mr. M. Alderton Pink follows on with "Towards a New Liberalism". Mr. C. F. Andrews tells us "What India thinks about the League", and M. Loisy continues to reply to Couchoud's views about the historicity of Jesus. Dr. W. G. Moore's "Kierkegaard and his Century" well deserves reading, as does Dr. C. J. Wright's " 'Validity' in recent Ecclesiastical Discussions".

Baptist Quarterly (July). The Rev. P. Austin starts from developments in Oxford and gives a sketch of the history of Regent's Park College. The Rev. R. L. Child writes on "The Ministry and the Sacraments", the Rev. L. H. Marshall on "Religion and Science" and Dr. Dakin on " Calvin's Doctrine of Baptism". Mr. T. R. Jones shows from Guy's Hospital Manuscripts how Thomas Guy sold out £100 shares in the South Sea Company at from £300 to £600 and invested the proceeds in gilt-edged securities. He realized altogether nearly a quarter of a million pounds.

The Layman (July). This number is occupied by accounts of missionary work in the Congo, China, and other parts of the world.

The Modern Churchman (June, July). The Editor, in addition to an article on "Four Views of the Nativity", has some strong comments on the new Bishop of Oxford's first episcopal pronouncement, in which he says that a denial of the doctrine of the virgin birth is subversive of fundamental Christian truth. The Rev. R. E. C. Houghton writes on "The Bible as Literature" and Prof. J. M. Creed on "Some Implications of the Report of the Doctrinal Commission".

Expository Times (June—Aug.). Many will turn first to the anonymous account of "The Fight for Christianity in Germany". Other interesting contributions are Dr. Rattenbury's "Worship and Sacraments", Dr. T. Hywel Hughes's "The Psychology of the Oxford Group Movement", and the Rev. A. M. Hunter's "Calvin". Among Congregational contributors are Dr. Garvie and the Rev. E. Shillito.

Friends' Quarterly Examiner (Seventh Month). Professor A. V. Murray writes on "Nominalism and Realism", Mr. E. E. Taylor on "Changes in Rural England", and Mr. J. R. Carter on "Germany's Expansion among her South-Eastern Neighbours". Dr. H. G. Wood's "Ends and Means in Education" deserves consideration by all engaged in teaching.

The Christian Quarterly (July). Dr. C. K. Green writes on the Oxford Conference, Mr. James Gray on "The Sacraments and Corporate Worship", and Mr. E. Lyall Williams on "The Relevance of the Church".

International Review of Missions (July). An enlarged number in preparation for the Madras Conference. Dr. J. R. Mott writes an introduction, Dr. N. Micklem on "The Faith by which the Church Lives"; Dr. Nicol Macnicol and Dr. Emil Brunner on "The Place of Reason in Religion". There is a "North African Reverie" by Miss C. E. Padwick, four important papers on "The Life of the Indigenous Church", and two papers on "Medicine in the Church" by Drs. P. H. J. Lerrigo and E. H. Hume.

World Dominion (July). An anonymous article on "Facing the Real Facts in Japan" is worth reading. Several writers deal with the position of the Church on the Continent and other articles are concerned with the North-West Frontier, India, Manchukuo, the Northern Rhodesian Copper Belt, and Madagascar.

The Evangelical Quarterly (July). Two important articles are Dr. R. J. Drummond's "The Real Presence in the Lord's Supper" and the Rev. T. M. Donn's "Evangelical Worship". "The Study of New Testament Geography" by the Rev. J. B. Johnston is also worth reading.

The Common Room (July). There are some workers' opinions on Russia and an account of Europe re-housed, as well as a survey of the British Press and a valuable account of an experiment by adult students in what is called "The Companionate Study of the Bible".

Social Service Review (June). Mrs. G. M. Trevelyan writes on the London Play Centres for Children, I. G. Goddard on "Child Guidance", Mrs. Chaloner on "The Need for Nursery Schools" and Miss W. M. Docking on "Playleadership".

Religion in Education (July). The Editor has gathered round him an interesting group of contributors. Dr. C. Anderson Scott has the first of two papers on St. Paul, this one dealing with St. Paul the Man; and Prof. A. E. Taylor discusses Mr. Aldous Huxley's *Ends and Means*.

The Yale Review (Summer). Two important articles are Mr. Walter Lippmann's "After Geneva: the Defense of the Peace" and Mr. W. L. Langer's "When German Dreams Come True". Mr. P. E. Mosely's "Recent Soviet Trials and Policies" is informing and so is Leon Trotsky's "If the World War Comes Again".

Religion and Life (Summer). The most important article in this number is Dr. W. Adams Brown's "World Council as Achievement and as Prophecy". Congregational contributors are Dr. R. H. Stafford ("The Christian Doctrine of Government") and Dr. J. W. Buckham ("The Ethical Supremacy of Jesus"). Dr. Maude Royden writes on Prayer and there is an interesting study of Berdyaev by Dr. Paul Tillich.

Anglican Theological Review (July). Mr. W. M. Washington outlines "a Federal Plan of Church Unity". The Church Congress Syllabus is continued in a useful article on "The Validity of the Constant Emphasis on Christian Evangelism in the Light of Contemporary Criticism".

The Review and Expositor (July). Most of the articles in this number are biblical and theological. Mr. F. S. Hickman's "The Evangelistic Problem in Modern Thinking" is interesting, and with it should be read Mr. J. G. Blackburn's "Men and the Modern Church".

The Colgate-Rochester Divinity School Bulletin (May). Mr. D. J. Evans continues his "What about Evangelism?". Prof. W. H. Coates discusses "The Meaning of Liberalism for Americans".

Harvard Theological Review (July). The Rev. W. L. Knox writes on "Jewish Liturgical Exorcism", Prof. Hans Lewy on "Aristotle and the Jewish Sage According to Clearchus of Soli", and Prof. C. C. Torrey on "Armageddon".

The main article in **In Extremis** (1938), No. 3-4, is Pasteur Pierre Maury's *Défense du Christianisme*, which is an imaginary discussion of the subject by students representing various countries and outlooks, and which those desirous of understanding the regular "knot" at theological students' conferences will be well advised to read. Addresses entitled *Die Not unserer Kirche* and *Wozu wird gepredigt?*, by Dr. Arthur Frey of Zürich and Prof. Günther Dehn respectively, are printed, and there is an appreciative review of M. Gilson's *Christianisme et philosophie*.